

Name	Address	Which route?	Do you have any other comments regarding the "Seat" route?
Alana Schrenk	1130 W Maria Lane	4	<b>Comment Card:</b> Money from the seat route should be re-directed to already existing roads with bike lanes. Guadalupe, Warner Rd and Kyrene. These roads are completely in disrepair. They are dangerous for cyclists and NEED to be improved. McClintock Rd is the <u>best</u> example of what is needed.
Alison Quinn	1264 E Wesleyan Drive	4	<b>Online:</b> I oppose this program. I encourage all of the council members to vote no.  <b>Email:</b> I strongly oppose the Bikeit program and I want each and every one of the council members to vote against it. Why did McClintock go from 3 lanes to 2 lanes? Do you live or drive on McClintock? Did you support this change? If you did then why? Explain the purpose of the BIKEIT program? What is the cost? Do you support this program and if you do why? I would like a prompt response especially since there is a public mtg tonight. What are you doing to keep my property taxes low?
Ann Conley	2053 E Caroline Ln	4	<b>1st Email:</b> I would first like to point out that residents along the “Seat” Route were not adequately informed of plans to implement bicycle boulevards through neighborhoods. Notices were not properly delivered and they did not contain information relevant to the proposed changes on each street and in each neighborhood. Second, the online forms and surveys try to force residents into a bike boulevard by only presenting a handful of options. Why are you asking where the “Seat” Route should end? Why aren’t you asking if we want a “Seat” Route? Why did you ask which intersection represents the highest priority for completion of new signalized crossings? What if we don’t want signalized crossings? There are no options of “No” or “None”.  <b>2nd Email:</b> Thank you for your response. I am glad post cards were mailed to all homes south of Warner. After talking to residents along the proposed bike path, I feel you need to address the content of your door hangers/postcards. Residents are not aware that the bike route is on streets in front of their homes. This is due to the fact that the streets referenced on the door hangers/post cards are in all neighborhoods in South Tempe and the order you list them (LaVieve, Lakeshore, Caroline, Knox) is not the order of the path. If referencing the route from West to East, they should have been listed as Knox Road, Lakeshore Drive, La Vieve Lane, Caroline Lane. There should have also been a note correlating each street to a neighborhood. Given that you are probably not delivering any more material for this route, this feedback is intended to assist when you generate material for other routes. I had to dig through content on the BikeiT website multiple times in addition to pulling up maps from other sources in order to fully understand the plans. Most people probably won't take the time and therefore are inadequately informed. I would also like to address what I heard about objection to the path only coming from neighborhoods on the east side of the route. The fact is there is only one neighborhood (Warner Ranch) on the west side of the route. The remainder of the route does not run in front of homes over there so why would anyone object? I'm not opposed to bike paths that don't run in front of homes on residential streets either. There are four streets/neighborhoods in which a large portion of bike route is passing in front of homes on residential streets. I know there has been an outpouring of opposition from Corona Del Sol Estates, Alta Mira and Circle G. Don't treat us as though we are a minority when in fact we represent most of the route directly affected. Knox Road in Warner Ranch Lakeshore Drive/La Vieve Lane in Corona Del Sol Estates  <b>Online:</b> Please consider these points. Related to the feedback, who exactly is filling out the online comment forms? I saw a survey response from a resident of Peoria. Should residents of other cities be able to vote on bike boulevards in Tempe neighborhoods? Residents in the affected neighborhoods should be making these decisions. These are our homes. It is our property values that will be affected. The position of “Seat” Route residents was made clear at the last public meeting. We do not want a bike boulevard through our neighborhoods. Will our position be accurately and completely conveyed at the next council meeting? In addition, if you proceed with implementation of the “Seat” Route despite resident objection, what happens if signalized crossings are not funded or approved? Are you going to have a series of unconnected paths that lead nowhere? Are bikes supposed to dangerously cross the road or are they supposed to travel up to a light to cross, then proceed down the wrong way of the street in order to get back on the bike boulevard? Why would you start a project without the funding and/or approval needed to complete it? Last, the message on the bike boulevards and traffic is mixed. The claim is that bike boulevards “attract new bicycle users and increase ridership”, but when residents complained about funneling this new bike traffic through neighborhoods, we were informed that the city did not expect an increase in bicycle traffic. The following are responses sent to residents concerned about bicycle traffic in their neighborhood: 1. "We do not anticipate a dramatic increase in ridership from outside your neighborhood" 2. "We do not anticipate an increase in people entering your neighborhood to use these bike boulevards" 3. "There is no indication that the new signage will result in non-neighborhood users" 4. "The goal of adding signage along the streets is to guide your neighbors along the Seat route to connect them to other parts of south Tempe" 5. "We do not anticipate a dramatic increase in ridership from outside your neighborhood to use these bike boulevards" Now I'm really confused. What is the point of the “Seat” Route? You want to spend an initial \$35,000, plus more later, to guide my neighbors out of our neighborhood? We know how to get out of our neighborhood. We don't need signs to guide us. Either you are bringing new traffic into our neighborhood or you

			are wasting money on something that isn't going to be used. We do not want a "Seat" Bike Boulevard running through our neighborhood!
Ben A. Nelson	1941 E Caroline Lane	3	<p><b>Online:</b> I live on East Caroline Lane and strongly support the Seat Route. I understand and respect the concerns about the proposed change: increased bike traffic on our streets, giving outsiders easier access to our neighborhood spaces, bikes riding on sidewalks, bikes interfering with us backing out of driveways. I bike to work on the proposed La Vieve version of the Seat route, connecting to the already partially completed Chain or Lakeshore-College Avenue route. My commute allows me to see some of the conditions we could experience if the new route enters our neighborhood. The number of bikes on Lakeshore-College Avenue is hardly noticeable except near ASU. I pass four parks; none seem to be visited by the feared outsiders except Daly Park, which is between Apache and Broadway, a more urban area. Since there are bike lanes, people don't ride on the sidewalks on this route. I do sometimes encounter people backing cars out of their driveways, less than once on average in each of my 8.7-mile one-way commutes. This is a problem only in that it is challenging to train little ones on bikes to beware of such dangers. The benefits of a fully built network of bike routes would far outweigh the costs, in my opinion. The benefits would be to household finances, health, environment, and most importantly to the safety of our children. The financial impact on a household can be positive and significant. During eight years when my kids were in college, my wife and I had only one car, and I biked to work most days. Since they graduated, we've bought a second car but drive it less than 5,000 miles per year. I estimate conservatively that I've saved \$40,000 because of the Lakeshore-College Avenue route. I am fitter than I would be without that regular exercise, maybe fitter than some youths who don't get sustained outdoor exercise. On the other hand I've developed allergy-induced asthma, which my doctors agree was probably brought about by breathing contaminated air during exertion. The main source of the contamination? We all know: annual emissions per passenger car average over 10,000 lbs. (<a href="http://www3.epa.gov/otaq/consumer/420f08024.pdf">http://www3.epa.gov/otaq/consumer/420f08024.pdf</a>). Finally, bike routes tend to keep cyclists off the main roads and out of the main intersections, which are no place for a kid on a bike. The former owner of our house told me that in 1994, a boy crossing McClintock at East Caroline Lane was too young to judge the speeds and distances, and was hit by a car and killed. In an economy that can find millions of dollars per mile for freeway construction, protected crossings seem a good value, even beyond their use in bike routes.</p> <p><b>Comment Card:</b> I will put my comments online.</p>
Benjamin C Mangilit	900 W. Grove Pkwy Apt 3046	3	<p><b>Online:</b> While I myself am an experienced road cyclist that commutes daily, I feel that these sorts of infrastructural investments are a necessity to convince Tempe citizens that bicycles are a viable method of transportation! People should not have to be afraid for their lives just to get around by means of transport that aren't cars.</p>
Bill Goodman	2058 East Myrna Ln	4	<p><b>Email:</b> Mr. Mayor and members of the city council, I would like to add my concerns to those raised by many other South Tempe residents regarding the proposed Bike Path in South Tempe. I must admit that I am puzzled by the push to place the bike paths in residential areas. I live in Circle G Ranches and there are numerous bike paths available for cyclists nearby, to include the canal path by the 101 and Price Roads and an expansive area in the Arizona State Research Park just to the north of us across Warner Road. Access to Circle G is limited to Fairfield off Warner and Caroline Lane off Price Road, and the Chandler city limits begin at the south end of our community, with no current access. Why is an additional 1/2 mile to the south of Warner so critical to cyclists? The key question is why the need to anger members of your community by forcing the Bike Path issue when there are the two bike routes mentioned above that are in close proximity and do not disturb our residential community. There is no "destination" to the south of us or within our community, and if cyclists wish to ride through Circle G, they are free to do so now without a designated bike route. Please do the right thing by rejecting this unwise addition to Tempe's current bike routes. This is a waste of taxpayer dollars that can be used for park improvements within the city and will also unleash an activist backlash for those who vote for this ridiculous and unnecessary Bike Path. We will remember those who vote for it and will support those who vote against it.</p>
Bradley and Joy Downing	1945 E Caroline Lane	1	<b>Online</b>
Bruce Hayes	1311 E. Ranch Rd.	4	<p><b>Email:</b> I attended the public meeting 11/5/15 which I thought was well attended by the local residents. I also believe the representatives from the City did a good job defending/explaining the intent of the City Council. It was pointed out at this meeting that the local residents had to make a choice of one of the three routes. Regardless one of the three options was going to be selected so be either being pushed or pulled we're going to get a bike route. The Bike It note I received in the mail from you implies the same thing. It was abundantly clear from the public meeting the vast majority in attendance don't want any bike route going through their neighborhood. We were informed that this is not a done deal and if the residents opposition to the bike route was greater than the support for It, the Seat route would not happen. I want to register my families opposition to the Seat route being built at all. I see the deadline for input is the 17th which is when I received it so I'm a day late. Please forward this to all members of the City Council. I'm certain I will attend the December council meeting when this comes up</p>
Bruce Strand	176 W Amanda Ln	3	<b>Online:</b> Go for it...
c wagner	caroline lane	1	<b>Online</b>

CAROLYN OLSON	1844 E CAROLINE LN	3	<b>Comment Card:</b> TRAFFIC SIGNAL INSTALLATION IN MUCH MORE IMPORTANT THAN SIGNAGE. THANK YOU FOR ATTEMPTING TO INCLUDE SOUTH TEMPE IN YOUR TRANSPORTATION PLAN. WE SHOULD SUPPORT BIKE RIDING! WE ARE SURPRISED AND DISTRURBED BY THE OPPOSITION.
Charlene Balnis	Warner Ranch	4	<b>Email:</b> To whom it may concern: I live in Warner Ranch and have been a resident for more than 10 years. Our community is quiet, safe and free from heavy traffic. I'm asking you why, when Warner Ranch Drive already has a designated bike lane that does NOT run in front of homes, are you proposing to put one through the middle of our neighborhoods. Foolish spending again.....I say NO to this proposal. Thank you for your time,
Charles Hiers/Latham	2031 E. LaVieve	4	<b>Call: Very</b> much opposed to the Seat route; this area is purely residential with a lot of older kids and many older adults out walking. This is a horse area. Many horse trails run through here. It would be a very dangerous situation to mix these. Thanks for listening.
cheryl roemke	9103 S. Kachina Dr.	1	<b>Online</b>
Chris Higgins	4728 S. River Dr	3	<b>Comment Card:</b> * I live close to 101 and would use the route #3. * RE: Bike Blvds. in general: as a daily bike commuter, I much prefer riding on non-arterial roads & support the bike Blvd. project. * I'm excited to hear about plans for paths along the highline canal, Kyrene canal & upper. * Keep up the great work & Happy Bicycling! have patience with the nimby nay-sayers! I enjoyed the meeting despite the negativity!
Chris Trask	PO Box 25240	3	<b>Comment Card:</b> I'm glad to see that the addition of signaled crossing at La Vieve & McClintock has received the highest priority in the long range improvements. This is an essential public safety issue in the establishment of the route.
Christina Cignarale		3	<b>Email:</b> Hello all! I have been a south Tempe resident for about 2 years now. I love being so close to many parts of Eastern phoenix in about 20 minutes by car. However, I do wish it was safer to bike around the area. There is a lot of traffic where I live and I do not feel safe riding a bike most hours in the day. It would be great to have dedicated bike lanes so that I could ride at my own pace out of the way of pedestrians and vehicles. I have a fear of getting hit since I see many people on phones and large trucks on the main streets (like south Priest). I did not have a chance to vote but I do hope my opinion can support the creation of bike paths so that we can have a healthy and active community that is not at risk for getting into serious accidents. Thank you!
CHRISTINIA HUDSON	954 E Westchester	3	<b>Comment Card:</b> LOVE IT. THANKS KOLBY, CORY, LAUREN, DAVID, MARK, ROBIN, JOEL!! USING SIGNS AND ROAD MARKINGS SETS A STANDARD THIS HELPS BIKERS AND NON BIKERS UNDERSTAND HOW TO USE THE SPACE SAFELY.  <b>Email:</b> Council, I am very much in favor of the entire Bike IT plan. Hope to use the Seat route soon! J Thanks for helping Tempe get to Gold! Thanks,
CLIFFORD ANDERSON	513 E ERIE DR	3	<b>Comment Card:</b> GREAT IDEA! THE OVERALL PLAN IS SOUND. THIS WILL BENEFIT CHARACTER OF NEIGHBORHOODS WHICH WILL HELP REAL ESTATE VALUES. THOSE NEW TO CYCLING OR NEW TO THE AREA WILL BENEFIT BECAUSE THESE ROUTES ARE NOT TRIVIAL TO DISCOVER AD HOC, AND THE ALTERNATIVE, TRAVELLING ON THE MAJOR THOROFARES, IS WORSE FOR CYCLING SAFETY AND CAN BE DISRUPTIVE TO VEHICULAR FLOW. THUS, THIS ROUTE WILL MOTORISTS BY DIVERTING BIKES TO SAFER, LOWER-SPEED ROUTES.
Dan Otis & Vena Lahn	1842 E. La Vieve Ln	3	<b>Online:</b> live on La Vieve Ln and my wife and I both support this route. While some are objecting to a new traffic light at La Vieve and McClintock, we support that as we think both the bike lane AND the traffic light will slow down drivers who speed down La Vieve. We need to encourage alternative transportation and extensive use of bike lanes will help do this. Thank you.  <b>Email:</b> My wife and I are strongly supportive of bike routes that go through South Tempe neighborhoods instead of along busy main roads. We need to encourage alternative forms of transportation to our citizens. Riding along major roads even in a bike lane is a harrowing experience with cars racing by at 50 mph or more. It is especially dangerous in this age of texting or dialing a phone while driving. Thank you for allowing us to express our opinions.

Darryl Jacobson Barnes	2009 E. Caroline Ln.	4	<p><b>Online:</b> Absolutely no!! Don't want any of these. If you must do start at Kyrene west to Highline Canal. Have no problem with signs on canals. Stay out of neighborhoods.</p> <p><b>Email:</b> Hi all, Just wanted you to know that the majority of our neighborhood is still opposed to the bikeit plans. But we do not want to have South Tempe put in a divide and conquer mode as it appears is being attempted. I have heard from many folks from Alta Mira, Corona del Sol, Tally Ho Farms and Warner Ranch and Estates, as well as some of the little non-HOA areas along the Seat Route. I guess when you are outspoken, people reach out so that you become the contact/spokesperson for them as well. So in short, no one wants it to be in their area. Warner Ranch believes that two of the areas also are privately owned in their subdivisions and thus also are beyond the authority of the council/transportation department, as privately owned property. It is our hope that you will respect the property rights of the neighborhoods as well as the character of our horse, agricultural, residential, communities, and not encourage folks with no public destination to cut through our neighborhoods. No one that I have spoken with wants the signs, the sharrows, or the lights. It seems to be a universal belief, by the majority, that this plan is a waste of taxpayer monies. Without repeating the discussion of the past in entirety, we would like to reiterate that we have no problem with bike boulevards along canals, or direction from major thoroughfares to these canal riding areas. However, Please don't infringe on residential properties, by funneling bike traffic all to one road in a residential area. People in the neighborhood know their way in and out, or should not be riding alone. Those not from here do not need a road map to quick get away and cut-through traffic planning...if they are taking a leisurely ride, then the exact path is not critical. Let them meander as they see fit, in the current scenario. This plan, has sadly brought back the call to gate by some in our neighborhood. It was a very divisive and nasty battle last time round, and we don't want these wounds reopened, but if the city chooses to put us on the route, this is the direction the neighborhood will most certainly go, leaving one more open space open no more. We would be happy to give you a list of items that we would feel are a better use of the \$100,000 budget for South Tempe if you would like to have a legitimate working group, and not a railroad, as many felt the Character meetings were. We want to be able to have open discussion about what we want in general, and not be given untenable choices where we are picking the lesser of the evils. Giving us sticky notes to put in columns of suggestions we did not make is not an open discussion. So again, I repeat, for all of South Tempe, please vote "no" on the Seat Route and also on the Future HandleBar route south of Warner...No problem if you want to continue North of Warner along River Parkway as this is not a residential corridor and makes sense as a "destination". Sincerely, PS there has been confusion among our neighbors as to whether they needed to vote again, if they still don't want this, but voted against it in the first input round. Hence I would ask that you have the Transportation Dept. include those who voted before in the final tally. If you are not comfortable with that, then extend the comment period, and state on your website that they do need to vote again, even if they voted in the first two comment periods.</p>
the barnes family		4	<p><b>Online:</b> None of these!!!! If we must pick one, it would be from Kyrene to the Canal as this is the only request for same in the GAP Plan. Residents have been quite clear that we don't need or want this. Do not ruin the character of our neighborhoods and invite unnecessary traffic in, with signage that serves no community purpose. In the April character meetings, the Tempe staff pushed for these things, as stated in italics, but the neighbors pushed back and said NO! Why are we on our 5th meeting trying to railroad this through. It is our tax dollars and this is not where we want them spent. Stop wasting our money on more and more meetings to try to get this through. People said they cared about weeds on Rural between Warner and Knox, they wanted the grants to continue, they wanted grey water to irrigate landscape on houses, and BIKE PATH IMPROVEMENTS ALONG IRRIGATION CANALS--not in the midst of residential neighborhoods in front of people's homes. What they said we needed was EQUESTRIAN emphasis! Nothing said South Tempe wanted bike emphasis! Also requested more green waste pick up, no more apartments/condos, but rather single family homes and patio homes. Does not appear that the staff or council is listening or has read the reports and understands what was suggested by staff, versus what the neighborhoods wanted or didn't want! Put the money towards the other suggestion which was to have circulators during peak hours of entertainment/dining so that people can go to downtown destinations without worrying about drinking and driving, or downtown parking issues. Also we asked for the ability to park and ride the light rail to the airport or have a form of dial-a-ride for airport commuters from south Tempe. This again would be a much better use of the \$100,000 and would be much more likely to make an impact on the number of cars on the roads.</p>
David Haglan	1727 E LaVieve Lane	3	<p><b>Online:</b> I live on LaVieve and the Seat Route goes in front of my house. My wife and two grade school aged children all ride bikes. We already ride the "seat route" and hope that Tempe will fully fund Option #3 and complete all the routes.</p>
David Kent Olson	1844 E Caroline Ln	3	<p><b>Comment Card:</b> The route should definitely extend east of McClintock. Please don't deny all of the residents E of McClintock access to the route. Residents of this area pay taxes to support public transit in other areas of the city. The absolute minimum residents of this area is a bike route (with a light across McClintock).</p>
David Nyer	1619 E 12th St	3	<p><b>Online:</b> This is a great route for connecting the bikeways of south Tempe. I don't live in the area but I do travel through on a semi-regular basis. This route makes my bicycle trip considerably more convenient.</p>



David Rice	212 W. Knight Ln.	3	<p><b>Online:</b> Since I assume comments from the first meeting will receive the same consideration as comments from the last, I'll just say that I use and appreciate the designated bike route on La Vieve and Caroline Lane. Tempe neighborhood bike routes shouldn't be top secret. You shouldn't have to pick up a Tempe Bikeways Map to know that there is a designated bike route on your street or in your neighborhood. <b>Email:</b> Mayor and Council, Improving accessibility improves the value of city assets. Pedestrian accessibility is poor in south Tempe as compared to the rest of the city. SAFELY CROSSING THE STREET The city needs to put in more midblock crossing in far south Tempe. It's difficult and unsafe to cross major roads without them. If we look south of Elliot Road, two thirds of the blocks don't have any mid block signals or crosswalks. It's pretty hard to find a single safe route to a destination if you can't cross a majority of the streets. There are 8 blocks that have a gap between pedestrian crossings of greater than ¾ of a mile in south Tempe. If we look at the entirety of Tempe, EVERY SINGLE major road that has a crossing gap of greater than ¾ of a mile exists in south Tempe, between Elliot and Ray Road. (I guess there is Mill Ave near Rolling Hills Golf Course, so this statement isn't entirely accurate) If we look at those 8 gaps, 6 of them would be filled if the Bike Boulevard system in south Tempe were fully implemented. The Eight Crossing Gaps in Tempe, South of Elliot: (*) = filled by fully implementing Seat (Knox) Route (**) = filled by implementing other proposed Bike Boulevard routes. • Priest, between Warner and Ray (*) • Kyrene, between Warner and Ray (*) • McClintock, between Warner and Ray (*) • Warner, between Kyrene and Rural (**) • Warner, between Rural and McClintock (**) • Warner, between McClintock and the ASU Research Park (**) • Kyrene, between Elliot and Warner (the one I'd prefer be fixed first) • McClintock, between Elliot and Warner (the one that should objectively be fixed first) Midblock crossings improve access to city and school facilities. Parks are more useful if people are able to cross the street to use them. Once you can safely go from Goodwin Park to Cielo to Mariposa to Manitas, before you know it, you can actually get a pretty long way. But it starts with being able to cross the street. INVESTING IN PARKS Parks are more useful if you can cross the street to use them. If we are not willing to improve pedestrian access to a park, we shouldn't be investing in that park. For example, let's look at Goodwin Park. We're putting about 120K into improving Goodwin Park. We shouldn't spend money on a park we don't want to provide access to. As the council will see in the presentation at the council retreat, Goodwin Park is considered a Green Light as far as play value, however in my opinion, it is a Red light in terms of pedestrian accessibility. You would probably increase the catchment area of Goodwin Park by 50% by adding a hybrid beacon at La Vieve and McClintock as part of the Seat Bike Boulevard. Please be consistent in the city's investments. Either continue investment at Goodwin Park and it's access, or stop investing in Goodwin Park and it's access. Considering all the parks in Tempe, how did Goodwin Park get chosen to be one of the first to be updated? It's a park with a small catchment area, and neighbors that don't want visitors. Don't invest in publicly subsidized "private" parks for individual subdivisions. Please make catchment area a factor in prioritization of park improvements. Thanks for your consideration,</p>
David Wattel	2010 E Caroline Ln	4	<p><b>Comment Card:</b> Big Waste of Money!!! No destinations in Circle G!!! No kids to ride from Circle G out elsewhere. Roads already available for bikers to use if they choose to ride.</p>
David Wissenbach	1237 W. Myrna Ln.	3	<p><b>Online:</b> I live in Sierra Tempe IV on the part of this route and commute on my bicycle to Chandler every day. I will prefer this route to Galveston once the signal at Knox and Kyrene is in place -- until then the route is much too dangerous to ride on a daily basis. You should discount the opinions of the people from the circle-J ranch because of their complete lack of civility at the public meeting.</p>
Dean Coonrod	292 E Caroline Ln	3	<p><b>Online:</b> The more buffering the better. Route 3 because the frontage road to 101 is quiet and actually quite bike friendly (especially b/w Warner and Ray). Signals / bikes crossings are important to seek funding.</p>
Deanna R. Carrera	245 W. Knox Road	4	<p><b>Email:</b> I do not want the route on my street. Knox Road between Kyrene and Dateland has homes facing the street. There is a bike path one street South on Warner Ranch Drive with no houses facing it, and it connects to Knox going towards Rural. Please use the existing bike routes! <b>Email:</b> I live at 245 W. Knox Road in Tempe, just East of Kyrene. It is on the proposed path of a bike lane. I am sending this email to you to let you know that my family opposes the bike path coming down my street. This residential street has homes that face each other and would face the bike path. There is already a bike path that is one street South of Knox, Warner Ranch drive, that is already a bike path. Warner Ranch drive is the main thorough fare into Warner Ranch and has no houses that face it. So it doesn't make sense to spend money to have another bike path one street away. In addition, I don't want a traffic light at Knox and Kyrene. Knox is not the main artery into Warner Ranch. Warner Ranch drive is. Please us this steet as the potential light. Again, we do not want the bike path and the light at Knox and Kyrene. In addition, why were the residents not notified about this proposed change? If I had known I would have gone to the November 5th meeting and voiced my opinion. Please let me know that you received my email opposing the plans for a bike path and light on Knox and Kyrene. Thank you</p>
Debbie Zarate		4	<p><b>Comment Card:</b> Improve and implement from existing canals and paths. No options are good. Please respect zoning for horses gated communities and industrial as well as existing communities walk paths. No public pathways for private communities. We have existing pathways that should be maintained and used. Tempe City Council should look at public routes on major streets only which connect to existing transportation routes and canal routes. Zero approval of Options 1,2 or 3. What signage is provided when bikers must walk their bikes due to sidewalks or other path restrictions.</p>

Denise Johnson	1051 W 9th St	3	<b>Online:</b> Thank you for this! I am much more likely to go and spend my money in south Tempe when I know there are safe, bike-designated routes to ride on. Also, thank you for making this a city-wide initiative, and not restricting routes by demographics of specific areas. Having designated, priority bike routes will increase safety for riders, attract others to more sustainable modes of transit, and make Tempe a better place to live! Email: Thank you Councilmembers for your commitment to dedicated bikeways. I am so glad you are putting the bikeways in, and that they will include proper signage and cycling infrastructure. As Tempe grows, it will be so important for the city to include multi-modal transit options as a benefit for the planet, for the economy, and for people. Not to mention, it fits in well with the 2040 general plan, and shows (not just talks) Tempe's commitment to sustainability. I've already done a lot more purchasing from the businesses along McClintock since the bike lanes went in, and will continue to expand my spending into other areas of Tempe (I live/work/play in dt) as convenient and safe cycling infrastructure becomes available. Can't wait for the entire bikeways system to be up and running! Thank you!
Diana Kekker	2029 E Caroline LN	1	<b>Online</b>
Diane L Winter	2028 E Caroline Ln	4	<b>Online:</b> If there MUST be a bike path then I vote for option 1 as it is the shortest, I am totally opposed to a bike path which will ultimately cost me and other City residents for traffic lights, etc. I do not want a bike path to funnel riders into my neighborhood, Circle G or that will drop riders at the PEDESTRIAN path which allows PEDESTRIANS to cross from Alta Mira into our neighborhood. There is no Purpose to funnel riders into Circle G. It dead ends at the 101 and forces riders to drive against traffic to turn North and is extremely dangerous with the road at the access road narrow. There is nothing in Circle G that qualifies for the City staff "purpose" of the path. In addition we have horses that a walked to the arena and can spook with the swift moving bikes. The path directly follows the road next to the arena. I am already concerned with backing my car out into Caroline and do not want riders encouraged to ride in front of my home. We have invested largely in our home and neighborhood. We maintain our tennis courts, racquet ball courts and horse arena. We have made a sizable investment in our home and its remodel. We want to keep our privacy as much as possible without gating our community. Since there is no reason to route riders though our community or to funnel them to a PEDESTRIAN walkway which is owned and maintained by a Circle G homeowner, there is no reason to pursue Option 2 or 3. As for Option 1, I do not think it has been proven such an option is worth the costs future stop lights will bring and I have heard plenty of dissension from residents of other neighborhoods who do not want that path. Please do not pursue this at our financial expense and the detriment of our privacy and with the knowledge that options two and three will send riders into an unsafe situation when they reach the 101 from Circle G. Many Circle G residents are very angry and unhappy about this proposed bike path.  <b>Comment Card:</b> I DO NOT WANT A SEAT ROUTE AT ALL. I FEEL IT IS UNCESSARY AND INFRINGES ON THE PROPERTIES THAT ARE ON THE PATH. I LIVE ON CAROLINE IN CIRCLE 6 RANCES ON CAROLINE. OPTION 2 AND 3 WOULD BOTH INFRINGE ON MY RIGHTS AS A HOME OWNER. I DO NOT WANT BICYLISTS DIRECTED IN FRONT OF MY HOUSE FOR PRIVACY AND SERCURITY REASONS. OPETION 2 ENDS AT THE PEDESTRIAN KENWOOD PATH AND OF COURSE RIDERS WOULD GO DIRECTLY PAST MY HOME. OPTION 3 DIRECTLY ROUTES PEOPLE PAST MY HOME. RIDERS WOULD END UP ON THE ACCESS TO THE FREEWAY AND BREAKING CITY OF TEMPE RULES TO HAVE TO RIDE THE WRONG WAY. MUST WE GATE OUR COMMUNITY TO HAVE THE QUIET ENJOYMENT THAT HOME OWNERSHIP SHOULD PROVIDE.YOU CANNOT DESIGN A BIKE ROUTE THAT CROSSES PROPERTY AT KENWOOD / LAVIEVE INTO CAROLINE IN CIRCLE G.
Dirk Lange	8830 S. Shannon Dr	4	<b>Online:</b> I think that setting up any of these routes through a residential neighborhood is unreasonable. Who wants thousands of people going through there neighborhood?
Doug Medesha	LaVieve Ln.	4	<b>Email:</b> Hello City Council, I understand the City is looking into modifying my home street. My wife and I have lived on La Vieve Lane since the mid-1980s and have enjoyed the location and the value of our property due to the low crime, low traffic and general quiet of the neighborhood. As far as the proposed changes, I am personally against them: Do you want a bike boulevard on your street? NO. Do you want your neighborhood to be a public transportation route? NO. Do you want a traffic signal at La Vieve and McClintock? NO. If East La Vieve Lane is left as is, there is no need for any of the changes that will be expensive and have a negative impact on the neighborhood. Thank you for your consideration.
Fawn Medesha	1551 E La Vieve Lane	4	<b>Email:</b> I have lived on La Vieve Lane since 1985. I live here because of the neighborhood is quiet and the traffic is low. Do you want a bike boulevard on your street? NO. Do you want your neighborhood to be a public transportation route? NO. Do you want a traffic signal at La Vieve and McClintock? NO. I am also extremely unhappy with what you did to McClintock. When you added a bike lane and took away a car lane. This has caused severe 5 o'clock traffic jams and increased pollution. People do not ride bikes where the average temperature is over 90 10 months of the year. Have you done a study on how many people use that bike lane? I have yet to see a single biker on it. What did that cost me? My taxes should be put to a better use than that.
Duane & Janet Slater	9214 S Lakeshore Dr	4	<b>Email:</b> Dear Major and City Council: We do not want a bike route on South Lakeshore Dr.(8800-9400) south of Warner Road and/or anywhere in Corona del Sol subdivision in south Tempe. Sincerely,
Elaine Brown	Warner Ranch Landings II	4	<b>Email:</b> I am a resident of Warner Ranch Landing II. I appose the route gong through our property. There are bike paths along Warner Ranch Drive that should be used. We do not want the liability that we might encounter if an accident would happen on our property.

Eleonore krebs	66 e. Maria lane	2	<b>Online:</b> I am really r xited about seeing way finding signs and pavement markings and also pleas d that all routes pass through Warner ranch. I will not be able to attend tonight's meeting, but wanted to express my approval of the planned improvements. Eleonore krebs
Eric and Debra Muilenberg	1953 E Caroline Lane	3	<b>Online:</b> We live in the home that is between Alta Mira and Circle G. Please MAKE SURE to redo the curb so that riders do not have to swerve into our drive to get onto Caroline from Circle G or visa versa, ie drop the curb down at the end of the passthru. We've held our breathes many a time!
Erin OGrady		4	<b>Email:</b> Hello all, Thank you in advance for taking the time to read this. Please consider this scenario prior to your votes related to Bike Boulevards throughout the City. Imagine that you are looking for a home to buy in Tempe. You find what seems to be the perfect house. On the light post nearest to your dream home, you see a sign showing that the house that you want to purchase is on a City of Tempe Bicycle Boulevard. You know from reading the BikeiT fact sheet on the City of Tempe webpage, that bicycle boulevards are a concept that has been designed to increase bicycle ridership of people who live within the city. That thought causes you to run this question through your mind as you decide whether to purchase this dream home that you love. "If the bicycle boulevard increases the number of people passing through this street, as it is designed to do, will that cause an increase in the probability of accidents, crime, and litter occurring on or near this property?" Let's continue our scenario, you leave that home and find another home for sale, one street over that is the perfect house too. (Tempe has so many lovely homes.) This home is NOT on a bicycle boulevard. The homes are identical and the same price. Which home would you choose? If any one of you chose the home that was NOT on the bicycle boulevard, you might want to start considering the possibility that bicycle boulevards may reduce property values in Tempe. If all of you can say "Yes, I would choose the home on the bicycle boulevard because it made that home more desirable, or because the sign (or sign's effect) didn't matter, you must still consider the people of Tempe that you are representing. What percent of Tempe residents would take the home on the Bike Boulevard to the one that wasn't along the route? Well, according to the August Bikelt survey's comments posted online and the comments at the November public meeting, the people that don't want the boulevard greatly outnumber the people that do want it. The reality of the situation is that bicycle boulevards could decrease property values by lessening the amount of people interested in the properties owned along the boulevard routes. Even if someone does purchase a home on the route, would they be willing to pay as much for that property as one not on the route? We all know that mistakes happen. Children and pets can be in the wrong place at the wrong time. People have blind spots as they back out of driveways. Garage doors malfunction leaving contents and entry points exposed. Personal property like cars, bikes, and other items of value get left out in front of houses. Would you want your children exposed to more strangers? Would you want increased odds of there being an accident as you or your guests back out of your driveway? Would you want your family, car, or house more vulnerable to crime? Whether or not the accidents, crime, and litter actually occur, it is the POTENTIAL of the occurrence that will cause someone to NOT choose the home along the boulevard, causing a devaluation of property in Tempe, not just along the Seat Route, but along any boulevard that goes through neighborhood streets, particularly those with front-facing houses to the routes. Additionally, if residents do not want/fund/support future signals connecting the boulevards through neighborhoods, the City of Tempe could end up with a bunch of segmented boulevards/painted streets, with no connection points on the main roads that would encourage bicycles crossing busy city streets in an unsafe manner. And according to the City's August survey results, the majority of respondents do not in fact support any of the signals connecting the Seat Bike Path, so this indeed is a problem. Another consideration that needs to be taken into account is the faulty data collection methods that took place to gather "data" for this project. First of all, the survey was open to anyone, not just Tempe residents, which creates the first problem. Secondly, how do you know if the majority of Tempe residents even want a SEAT bike path or any bike path in Tempe when none of the surveys presented thus far gave residents the option of "None of the above?" The survey acts as though the bike path is a done deal, and we are left with the choice of choosing a route versus the opportunity to say, "No, we don't want a bike path at all." Of course, people could write that in the comment box, but if they already think a path is a done deal, why would they? Just because money is available from the Feds and/or City taxes doesn't mean it SHOULD be spent or that residents want it to be spent this way. Just because there are bike enthusiasts and a minority of residents who attended the Character Development meetings in Tempe who have requested more bike paths, doesn't mean that the majority of Tempe residents want money spent this way, and due to the faults in your survey, some residents' real opinions are not being fully disclosed. Has the City ever considered someone with a background/education in Research and Evaluation to oversee City surveys that are put out to gather data to increase the validity of results? We all know in the real estate industry that LOCATION is the number one consideration that will determine property values. Well in this situation, it is not the concept of bicycle boulevards that is the problem, it is the location of the proposed routes that is the problem. For example, nearly fifty homes in the Warner Ranch area "front- face" the bike path due to it passing along their street, when no homes in this area could have been front facing the bike path if Warner Ranch Drive was selected instead of Knox. Warner Ranch Drive is only one street South of Knox at this point on the path, and already has bike lanes painted on the street which would save the City of Tempe and their taxpayers' money. I like to ride my bike with my family, and do so without the city (and thousands of dollars going towards) telling me where a pathway is located. Vote no to end the concept of bicycle boulevards through neighborhood streets. Act PROACTIVELY to reduce accidents, crime, and to prevent property devaluation, not reactively. Move bicycle boulevards to locations away from our neighborhood streets.
Fred Taylor	267 E. Caroline Ln.	4	<b>Online:</b> I do not support improvements on any routes. We don't need signs to identify a route - bicyclists can go online to find a route. I don't understand the sharrows on Knox by Hanger Park - the road is not wide enough for parking, designated bike lane and vehicle traffic, particularly with the "traffic calming structure." If you are set on purchasing signage, then we need signage telling bicyclists it's illegal to ride on sidewalk. I'm tired of dodging them. <b>Comment Card:</b> There is no need to spend additional funds on bike lanes. I am particularly concerned about sharrows - bikes don't have the right to use the "full lane"
GAIL ANDREWS	1961 E JEANINE DR	4	<b>Comment Card:</b> I DO NOT WANT THIS AT ALL!



Gary Busenkell	2088 E Ranch Rd	4	<b>Online:</b> I believe the whole concept is flawed. It represents someone's unrealistic idea of what people want in their community. I believe it will prove to be another waste of taxpayer money. It will be used by few. I am opposed to the concept.
Geoffrey Foster		3	<b>Email:</b> I'm in favor for seat route #3. I think adding designated biking routes in the city is a great idea and use of money.
Gillian Kirkpatrick	2050 E Knox Rd	4	<b>Comment Card:</b> None of the above. A point that someone brought up at the meeting. Access onto 101 from circle & is a very narrow/dangerous route. On & car only can go through. multiple bikes would be very difficult.
Greg Gilstrap	1945 E. Greentree Drive	3	<b>Online:</b> For the unfunded/future signal at McClintock and La Vieve - that signal should be like the signal at McClintock & Sun Cir Trail (lights stays green for traffic on McClintock except when a pedestrian/cyclist needs to cross the street). That will be the least disruption to the traffic on McClintock.
Greg Tripp	9003 S. Dateland Drive	3	<b>Email:</b> Regarding the SEAT bike improvements, I am in full support of the SEAT bike boulevard improvements. I live in the neighborhood at 9003 S. Dateland Drive, and have since 1993.I have ridden much of the proposed SEAT bike boulevard and see this as a positive impact on safety and ease of transit. We have a lot of bikes passing through the neighborhood and am looking forward to seeing even more. As for the Handle Bars bike route, I would really like to a crosswalk or light on Warner Rd between Kyrene Rd and Dateland Drive at the canal. I see this investment in alternative transportation is critical to the quality of life of our wonderful city. Thanks,
Greg Vasquez		4	<b>Email:</b> Dear Mr. Mayor and Council Members; I live on Knox Rd. Just off of Kyrene. I am writing about the new bike path proposal. We have enough car and bike traffic as it is so why does Tempe want to put more bike traffic on Knox Rd. As it is Warner already has a bike lane so why move bike traffic to my neighborhood street, running get past my front door?? There small children playing in this neighborhood, including my grandkids, so why invite strangers, possibly predators, to our street/homes?? Please do not continue with this plan. Leave the bike path on Warner where it already exists. Thank you for your time and consideration.
Greta Caldwell	2007 E. Myrna Ln.,	3	<b>Email:</b> thanks for sending this out. I'm all for the bikers using our neighborhood as a by pass route! In addition to slowing down traffic on the Circle G streets it will also alleviate some of the bike traffic on Warner Rd and the 101 access road. Great idea!!!
Howard Martinson	1814 E La Vieve Lane	4	<b>Online:</b> NONE OF THE ABOVE!!! Why is "None" not an option? I will not support unless the possibility of the "light" is removed from the intersection of La Vieve and McClintock.
Ira A. King, Jr.	1305 E. La Vieve Ln.	4	<b>Email:</b> I have lived at 1305 East LaVieve Lane since 1992 and love my neighborhood. The traffic speeding on Lakeshore and Juniper heading for and leaving the Elementary School had a strong negative impact on the neighborhood and now a bike path past my house and all houses on LaVieve to join the traffic flow on Lakeshore . Has anyone thought about decrease in property value and neighborhood security due to converting our neighborhood street to a valley wide pathway. Please rethink this !!
Jackie Martin	1227 W. Elna Rae St	3	<b>Email:</b> Hello, I wanted to thank everyone involved in panning the "Seat Routes" and Bike Boulevards. This helps to make Tempe safer for cyclists and cars. My boyfriend rides to work along what will be the Seat Route, and it will make it so much safer for him. Also, hopefully people will start to realize that for short commutes, like one or two miles, you can bike that in 10 minutes - the same time as driving! Having safe, well-marked options will encourage people to consider biking. As the Tempe population continues to grow, we need to start thinking long-term about how to accommodate all the traffic and commuting needs for the community, and this is a great start. Thanks! I support what you're doing!
Jacob Spencer	1958 E Ranch Rd	2	<b>Online:</b> Complete option 2 by going north on Kenwood, crossing Warner to the dirt path. The path is the safest route to the Western Canal, avoiding crossing Fairfield on Warner and the busy Smashburger plaza on Elliot. It also avoids Circle-G, whose residents seemed opposed to bike paths at public meetings. <b>Comment Card:</b> THIS IS A GREAT IDEA AND WILL IMPROVE QUALITY OF LIFE. PLEASE CONSIDER PRIORITIZING SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS AT MAJOR STREET CROSSINGS- MCCLINTOCK AND KYRENE CANAL AND ELLIOT AND WARNER, KENWOOD - EQUESTRIAN PATH AND WARNER
Janet Saucier	170 West Knox Road	4	<b>Online:</b> I do not want a bike boulevard in my neighbourhood.
Jeff Caslake	1621 S Parkside Dr.	3	<b>Online:</b> Connecting this route to Chandler during this project will be better than postponing that park of the route until later.
Jeff Hawley	4327 N 78th st	3	<b>Online:</b> Keep doing what you're doing! I don't live in Tempe but I bike there about 5 times a week! Love the infrastructure you're building and alternative transportation routes (especially not on road route). Bike boulevards are going to be a very valuable asset to the community. <b>Email:</b> I just wanted to drop a line and let you guys know what a great idea the bikeit boulevard plan is! Giving people an off street bicycling option with draw out many more cyclists in the area. People will be more inclined to start cycling off street rather than starting in the "scary" bike lane. Once they become more comfortable with it they will realize bike lanes are nothing to be scared of and cycling and alternative modes of transportation will grow further. Bikeit Boulevards are good for the community, business, commuters, and Tempe as a whole. Love the work that you're doing! Keep it up and thank you so much!!
Jennifer		4	<b>Online:</b> I think that there could be a much better use of the cities funds than pursuing bike boulevards through neighborhoods. I am against all of the routes and spending taxpayers money on this project.



Jennifer Sweeney	1918 E. Myrna Lane	3	<b>Email:</b> I am writing to let you know that I live with my husband and children in the Alta Mira neighborhood. I wholeheartedly support the "Seat" Bicycle Boulevard. Our home is one block from the proposed route and steps from Goodwin Park. I do not believe that the negligible number of bicyclists riding through our neighborhood while following "Bikelt" signs would have a negative impact on Alta Mira, because I myself follow alternate routes within neighborhoods throughout the city when I ride by myself or with my family. The bike commuter lanes on busy arterial streets like McClintock and Warner are not a good fit for family outings using recreational bicycling equipment, especially children's bikes. In many areas, bicyclists like myself have had to develop our own personal routes through trial and error, but where way finding signs do exist, such as in the Kiwanis Park neighborhood, we are able to transit the residential area more quickly and safely, causing less disruption for neighbors. I am eagerly looking forward to the "Bikelt" signage in Alta Mira and throughout Tempe, and to a controlled crossing of McClintock at La Vieve when funding permits.
Jessica Goldman		3	<b>Email:</b> Hi there! I'm a resident of corona Del sol estates and I live on La Vieve Lane where you will be voting on whether or not to designate the Seat route. I think this is a great idea and I'm quite excited. I live three houses in from McClintock and I feel a traffic signal will greatly improve the traffic in the area. Also, the bike boulevard will help make it possible for me to bike my kids to school across Warner. Please vote yes. Thanks
Jin-Jer Hwan	2052 E. Myrna Lane	2	<b>Online</b>
Joan Stein	1427 East LaVieve Lane	4	<b>Online:</b> None of the options is appropriate for our residential area. Please do not include LaVieve Lane as part of the "Seat" route.
Joe Struttman	1116 W. Maria Ln	4	<b>Online:</b> Thanks for the opportunity to speak at the public meeting on Nov 5th. I am both a motorist and an avid cyclist who rides over 9k miles/yr, and have lived in Tempe for over 30 years. My rides span the spectrum from easy neighborhood rides to competition, and I represent the interests of many cyclists. Below is a summary of my recommendations regarding the Seat route, followed by my reasoning. In order of preference:1. Do not implement the Seat route and instead use the funding to maintain existing facilities or to install facilities on arterial streets that yield a better cost/benefit.2. If the Seat route is implemented:2.1. In phase 1, install center median cyclist/pedestrian refuges at the crossings on Priest Dr, Kyrene Rd, and McClintock Dr. Do not install traffic control signals in phase 2.2.2. Use bicycle guide/wayfinding sign terminology as described in Guide for Development of Bicycles Facilities section 4.11, and the state law mandated Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. Regarding item #1: Safety should be the number one priority and use of limited funds on this route does not appear to yield a good cost/benefit. The proposed route is along low speed and relatively safe roads, and does not appear to offer any safety benefit. Instead it may well decrease safety in Phase 1 as described in the discussion in item # 2.1 below. These funds should be allocated toward facilities along the major arterial streets where they can have a larger impact on safety due to the larger speed differential and more dangerous mix of motor vehicle types.Tempe frequently states they have built over 175 miles of bikeways, but it is not the number of miles that is important, it is the quality of those miles with respect to safety and convenience. A significant portion of Tempe's bikeways are poorly designed and maintained, and do not meet commonly accepted standards for bicycle facilities. A few examples are bike lanes along Warner, Guadalupe, and Hardy (including north of Guadalupe). Very serious design and maintenance issues exist along these roads, and that is where the funding should be allocated, instead of creating more future obligations. If Tempe continues to insist upon new facilities instead of improvement and maintenance of the existing ones, there are many areas in South Tempe that could benefit from new cycling facilities, including Priest Dr and Elliott Rd. It was stated the estimated cost of the traffic control signals alone is \$450-\$600k. That amount of funding could be used to add many miles of useful bike lanes, such as extending the new McClintock lanes to Tempe's southern border.Regarding item #2.1: The installation of the Seat route raises safety concerns where it crosses the arterial roads. The installation of wayfaring signs and such by the City of Tempe is a signal to some that it is considered a safe route for cyclists. Some cyclists will think "why else would the city put it here". This is similar to when motorists and cyclists think a section of road is safe for cyclists just because the city has installed a bike lane, but that is not true for a sub-standard bike lane. Of course everyone who crosses at these locations is responsible for their own safety and should take the normal precautions of diligently checking for traffic before crossing. But human factors (nature) must be taken into account, which means that some will be less cautious and more cavalier when crossing at these locations. They will have a misperception of increased safety just because the city endorsed and built it, but that will not be the reality, resulting in decreased safety for these "mislead" individuals.The installation of center median refuges would at the least mitigate this risk for the "mislead", and even better would increase safety for everyone. This allows people crossing to only have to navigate traffic flowing in one direction at a time as they can safely stop at the center median before proceeding across the counter flowing traffic lanes. This could eliminate the need for three traffic signals at an estimated total cost of \$450-600k and the associated complaints of too many traffic lights. The center median refuges could also be used to discourage traffic from turning onto the Seat route, which is a stated goal of bicycle boulevards, that this route as presented does not have. However this aspect of the center median refuge should be presented to, and comments obtained from, local residents prior to implementation.Regarding item #2.2: Regarding bicycle guide/wayfinding signs terminology, the Guide for Development of Bicycles Facilities section 4.11 states in part (Bold added for clarity): "The D series (green bike route sign and various destination plaques) includes the green "BIKE ROUTE" sign (D11-1)," as well as an alternative sign that replaces the words "BIKE ROUTE"with a destination or route name (D11-1c) (see Figure 4-25). Use of this alternative is preferred whenever practical, as it provides the rider with more useful information than the D11-1. Routes should be named with either a term that describes the corridor (for example, a route that generally follows a waterway or valley, or a route that follows or parallels a well-known street), or a destination, using a relatively well-known place reference that is at the end of that specific route." Having ridden many bicycle facilities in various cities, states, and countries I can attest to the fact that using descriptive terminology is much more user friendly, and results in less stress, time, and errors in reaching the desired destination.Tempe's intended use of route names such at "Seat" and "Chain" are creative, but do not convey any

			useful information on their own. The cyclist would have to stop to refer to a printed map they would have to carry, or use an electronic device if they had one and knew where to search, to find their way. It is much preferred to serve the customer (cyclist) with information they can quickly and efficiently process and use. More descriptive terms for the "Seat" route might include "Knox" or "South Tempe". Destination and direction signs using terms such as "I-10" and "SR-101" would be much more user friendly.Sincerely,Joe Struttman Pecos Action Group
John Haver		4	<b>Email:</b> There is already too much traffic on La Vieve Ln. There is a multitude of cars, bikes and joggers going through our neighborhood. We really do not need another traffic signal on McClintock. It is a peaceful street on both sides of McClintock and a traffic signal will inconvenience all passers by as well as the residence at the proposed traffic signal. Please vote NO on the BIKE BOULEVARD "SEAT" ROUTE LA VIEVE LANE.
John B Sloan	174 W. Knox Rd	3	<b>Online:</b> I know there will be a strong opposition by those who subscribe to NIMBY and will reject this proposal out of hand. We were visited by such a neighbor this morning. The bike seat routes is a bold plan. Hopefully it will succeed.
John Keller	2029 E Caroline LN	1	<b>Online</b>
John L. Rucker	221 W. Knox Road	4	<b>Email/Online (duplicate):</b> My name is John Rucker. I have lived at 221 W Knox Road for over 20 years. I am opposed to a bike boulevard on Knox Road in Warner Ranch. Please vote no. Please stop this project. I am opposed to having any special striping, signage or obstructions to traffic flow. I do not want the city to encourage new bike traffic on my street or to slow vehicle traffic by giving bicycle riders who don't live in our neighborhood special treatment. I believe neighborhood residents should have priority to use their neighborhood streets. I purchased my home because it is in a quiet neighborhood on a pretty street. I would not purchase a house at this location if there was a bike boulevard down the street. As a state certified real estate appraiser (over 30 years of experience) , I am of the opinion that this project will cause property values to decline along the path. It will certainly make the homes less marketable and limit potential buyers. There are several opportunities for bicycle riders along the canal system that is nearby that would not interfere with neighborhood traffic. Funds would be better spent making it easier for bicyclists to use paths along the canal system and cross at Warner Road – similar to lights for bicycle riders along the canal system in other locations. I don't see the logic in encouraging bicycle riders to ride down neighborhood streets where cars may be backing out. Bicycle riders are hard to see. I would support a future traffic signal at Knox Road and Kyrene Road to facilitate left turns from Knox onto Kyrene Road. Left turns are very difficult during rush hour. A traffic light would also help bicycle riders along the canal system cross. Please stop this project. If the goal is to help bicycle riders, make further improvements to the paths along the canal system. Thank you for your consideration.
Jonathan Betancourt		4	<b>Email:</b> NO to bike boulevard.
Morgan Betancourt		4	<b>Email:</b> No to a bike boulevard on Lakeshore Dr.
Jon Mulford	165 W Amanda Lane	3	<b>Online:</b> Option 1 is great as it leads north on Fairfield to go to ASU Research across Warner, then across Elliot to Discovery and then to the Western Canal. Alternatively through Circle G to The 101 frontage road which leads to the Galveston Loop then back to Warner Ranch. <b>Email:</b> I would encourage the council to vote for the new Seat Route option 3. This makes the most sense for riders to go from Kyrene through Warner Ranch on Knox Road past Rural to Lakeshore then to LaVieve where a light is proposed for crossing McClintock. Continuing on LaVieve through to Circle G. On that route one can continue east to the 101 frontage and take the Galveston loop or go north on Fairfield Drive. Fairfield leads to Warner. A short jog right takes one to the light and crossing into Research Park through to Elliot and again crossing at a light into Discovery Business Park The bike lanes in Discovery lead around to the Western Canal and more great riding. A great plan for bicycling in South Tempe.
Karen Mulford	165 W. Amanda Lane	3	<b>Online:</b> The best route to eventually connect to the Western Canal through Research Park and Discovery Business Park <b>Email:</b> Hello, Thanks for your previous email asking for comments on the new Bike Seat Route options. Since my husband and I ride frequently in south Tempe, I am very interested in having a convenient, scenic and well-marked Route. Keeping Tempe a bike-friendly city is important to me. I prefer option 3 - Highline Canal to Price Road/Loop 101. I often use this route and find it a pleasant ride through scenic neighborhoods and an easy way to navigate to Warner Road and ride through ASU Research Park, Discovery Park and then onto the Western Canal bike path. Looking forward to hearing the results of this project.

JOSEPHINE LEVY	1836 E JEANINE	3	<p><b>Online:</b> I was so embarrassed at the rudeness of residents at last night's third public meeting. I hope five extremely rude people do not carry more weight on this issue than they should. They attacked the presenters, called them liars, interrupted other commenters, and generally created an atmosphere of hostility and intimidation. OVER A BIKE PATH. A stranger to the topic might imagine that we were discussing placement of El Chapo's exit tunnel. While I can understand genuine concerns, etc., the fact is that cities must address bicyclists in ways that create safe passage around town. It's actually an asset to the city and its residents. The many people in south Tempe in favor of (or neutral to) the bike path likely looked at the flyer, thought ""oh cool, bike routes"" , and went on with their day.Part of being in a community is understanding that we are part of a ""give and take"" in order to meet the many needs of its diverse people. It is true that south Tempe sometimes feels apart from Tempe's focus, (we never get the cool breakfast places!) and now we can see why. Shame of those few who are unable to manage themselves in a public forum.</p> <p><b>Comment Card:</b> I LOVE THE IDEA OF MAKING OUR COMMUNITY SAFER FOR BIKE RIDERS. PLEASE TELL ERIC AND JULIAN I AM SORRY THAT PEOPLE HERE ARE SO SELFISH AND RUDE. THANK YOU FOR HAVING THE MEETINGS!</p>
K. COSGROVE	2060 East La Vieve Lane	4	<p><b>Online:</b> There was not an Option 4 for "None of the above". I am strongly against having this bike route anywhere near where we live. I am a widowed mom with two children. Just this past June, we had an incident occur with a gentleman on a recumbent bicycle. We were driving out of Circle G Ranches onto Warner Road. This man, who was not utilizing the designated bike path on Warner, came cycling east bound down the walkway path. We stopped several feet behind the stop sign there (which is before the designated bike path). Rather than pedaling around our car, this man pedaled directly to the front left wheel well of my car, pinning my vehicle. At first, I thought he was playing some kind of a joke, but after several minutes of just sitting there with my car pinned, both myself and my children became very scared. I asked him politely to please drive around the front of my car, as by now I had someone on our tail, annoyed that we weren't moving. One of our neighbors also witnessed this craziness. After realizing he had me in a difficult spot, shaking, I contacted the Tempe Police Department. He finally biked around the front of our car. Additionally, we have had trash cans knocked over by bicyclists and also lost landscape lighting, due to the same reasons. It's situations such as this, which make a single mom extremely nervous about having a designated path for people, such as this, to come through our neighborhood &amp;/or the surrounding neighborhoods. PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW THIS BIKEIT PLAN TO PASS...</p>
Karthik Rajan	2117 E. Ranch Rd	4	<p><b>Online:</b> I am not choosing any of the Options 1, 2 or 3. Please, let us NOT have Bike Blvd Seat Route through the neighborhoods. Pls use the existing canal and other routes that do not run through neighborhoods for the Bike Blvd seat routes. Thanks.</p>
Katherine Huxster	850 S River Drive, UNIT 1057	3	<p><b>Online</b></p>
Kathleen Burd	1959 E Ranch Rd Tempe AZ	1	<p><b>Online:</b> It is crucial that a signal be installed at McClintock and La Vieve Ln. The signal at Warner and McClintock is NOT SAFE to cross on a bike, I've almost been hit dozens of time by motorists turning without looking. Residents east of McClintock need a safe way to bike with children to school and for Corona Students to get to school safely on their own!! It's prudent that our city be more bike and walker friendly.</p>
Kathy Beebe	9127 South Kachina Drive	3	<p><b>Online:</b> Why didn't you follow Knox straight thru to McClintock? I ride my bike that way to Cielo and Corona High School. Everybody rides that way from Alta Mira! I use Corona Drive and Caroline at McClintock. It makes sense.</p>
Ken Refner	2127 E. La Vieve Lane	3	<p><b>Online</b></p>
Kenna Locascio	LaVieve Ln.	4	<p><b>Email:</b> My name is Kenna LoCascio and I live on LaVieve Lane and I absolutely do NOT want the Bike Seat Route to go down my street or in my neighborhood. I already have a difficult time backing out of my own driveway in the morning due to the heavy traffic that comes down my street to get kids to school at Cielo Elementary. The majority of the kids that attend Cielo elementary are out of boundary students so their parents drive them to and from every day and the traffic in the morning is very busy down LaVieve and Lakeshore. Also, there are designated bike lanes just north of the school on Lakeshore and there are bike lanes on Warner Road. Let the bicyclists ride in the lanes that have already been provided for them. I do not want a designated bike seat route on LaVieve Lane.</p>

Kevin K.		4	<b>Email:</b> I am opposed to the City routing public bike traffic through PRIVATE property in local area neighborhoods for several reasons. First off, many of the proposed areas are PRIVATE property and the City has no business directing routine PUBLIC traffic, bicycle or otherwise, through these areas. Secondly, it is extremely UNSAFE - many areas proposed on the "Seat" route specifically are narrow sidewalks our area children use to walk to and from school, these are areas close to our cluster mailboxes where vehicles and pedestrians gather, and they are areas with very narrow walkways used by many pedestrians of all ages - many with small children and/or pets in tow. Next, it is an unnecessary expense as the City already has GREAT public bike lanes that are nicely designed, very well-marked and safe. These bike lanes exist today and are already established and paid for - and they are just ONE STREET OVER from this new proposed route. I am a bicyclist myself and I use these existing lanes often. Lastly, many of these newly proposed route areas are owned by local neighborhood HOA Associations who can refuse this increased traffic at any time. It is PRIVATE property, so fences can be built around these areas, existing private walkways can be eliminated, areas can be changed to various surfaces not conducive to bicycles. The City of Tempe needs to keep all designated bike routes on City-owned property. Thank you.
Kip Goldman	510 W Howe St	3	<b>Online</b>
Kristian Doak	504 W Brown Street	3	<b>Online:</b> This is a highly important bikeway, not only for cycling enthusiasts, but also for regular commuters and, far more importantly, children who cycle to school along this route. Growing up in Circle G, I rode this route regularly, and it took me a very long time to figure out the best way to ride it. If the path had been labeled, I would've become a far better and more consistent cyclist much more quickly, with all the benefits to health and happiness that entails. I want other children and adults to have the opportunity to safely experience the joy of cycling, which is why I strongly encourage the Tempe City Council to adopt option 3, which is by far the longest and nicest of the bike routes available, and would finally extend the amenities of the city's cycling network to Circle G Ranches.  <b>Comment Card:</b> I HAVE RIDDEN THIS BIKE ROUTE FROM THE 101TO CORONA DEL SOL FOR YEARS- IT WAS THE WAY I GOT FROM MY HOUSE TO SCHOOL FOR THREE YEARS. I WANT OTHER KIDS TO HAVE THE SAME OPPORTUNITY THAT I HAD TO FIND THE PLEASURE AND JOB OF BICYCLING.
Linda Kurth	8852 S. Lakeshore Dr.	4	<b>Online and Email (duplicates):</b> I am opposed to all three routes for the Knox Road Alignment bike route because of the section on Lakeshore Drive south of La Vieve with a possible future plan for an expansion of this route north of La Vieve on Lakeshore. The Corona del Sol subdivision is primarily a neighborhood of elderly couples that do NOT ride bikes and have few younger people or children that might. Because of the Cielo elementary school at the end of Lakeshore Dr. and Knox, speed bumps have already been installed along Lakeshore south of Warner to Knox because of the amount of traffic on Lakeshore, which is the major entrance to this subdivision. These speed bumps were installed for the safety of the students at Cielo, which mostly come from other surrounding subdivisions, not Corona del Sol subdivision. Any bike path on Lakeshore Dr. would only bring in more congestion to that road as people from surrounding neighborhoods would be passing through. We do NOT need a bike path on Lakeshore which would cause even more traffic on Lakeshore Dr. hindering the safety of the students at Cielo. Moving the route west and south towards Corona del Sol High School would be a better way to go. Again, I am opposed to any bike route that would be on Lakeshore Drive between Warner and Knox. Your consideration of an alternative route avoiding Lakeshore Dr. would be greatly appreciated



			<p><b>Online:</b> We DO NOT WANT, OR SUPPORT, A DESIGNATED BIKE LANE FOR THE BIKE SEAT AT THE LA VIEVE LN/KNOX RD ALIGNMENT. Below are the specific reasons:• At the most recent meeting of November 5th to discuss this bike route the majority of the participants (over 75%) were opposed to these particular bike seat routes – there were numerous representatives from all of the neighborhoods through which the path would run.• Safety is an utmost concern. As residents who are required to back out onto a ¼ mile through street, there is a fair amount of traffic that exists on this street already during early morning to late business hours.• As residents of the Corona del Sol neighborhood, we do not want to encourage additional traffic, bike or otherwise, into our neighborhood. We already have enough traffic with the residents and the traffic into the neighborhood for the schools. We feel this proposed effort by the City of Tempe will not benefit us but, will in fact do just the opposite.• Based on observation, early morning hours brings a tremendous amount of traffic down northbound-southbound McClintock Drive already. Adding eastbound-westbound traffic is a recipe for unsafe and congestion that can be avoided.• I am very opposed to having a bike crossing light at La Vieve and McClintock This location is too close to the next major street (Warner) which is where the bikes should safely cross.o Having a bike crossing light at this area will make it very difficult for the residents of the neighborhood to get into and out of our neighborhood.o There is also a safety impact to my driveway – my driveway is located on the east side of my home and directly connects to the northwest curb return at this intersection. Bike traffic will add even more moving objects that could easily be hidden by blind spots in this intersection. Adding more traffic, especially the fast moving bikes, to mix will be a bad liability for all involved.• The money for a bike crossing light would be much better spent at a high use area that truly needs it, such as the crossing for the Western Canal bike path at Guadalupe. This is a heavy use area, plus it's right next to the high use park of Kiwanis, that could really use a bike crossing light.• Additional traffic into this area will only lead to an installation of a traffic signal in the future. This act will add a tremendous unsafe burden of traffic coming from blindspots and directed on the immediate residents on the corner homes adjacent to McClintock Drive. My driveway entrance CANNOT be shifted westerly. Even one fatality here is too many. In turn, this is considered as additional risks imposed on the residents when in fact the neighborhood will not be the biggest beneficiary of the traffic signal.• If this seat route and eventual traffic signal is added to La Vieve, it will inevitably change the La Vieve homeowners street parking rights, regular, recycle, and bulk trash pick-up requirements.• When all of the above conditions are combined, it leads to reduced home values for the immediate residents, liability and legal issues. • ASU Research Park and its new leases will be the biggest recipients and beneficiary of the seat route and this will be accomplished at the expense of the Corona Del Sol, Circle G, and Alta Mira neighborhoods. This is a huge question that should be addressed. It would be very wrong, politically or otherwise of the Tempe City Council to impose this hardship on the residents of these neighborhoods.• There are already well marked and designated bike paths along McClintock and the various cross streets (Warner, Elliott, etc) and there is not a true need for bikes to cross through the interior neighborhoods.• Money for bike paths should be spent on the truly well-used areas, such as the canal paths, and expanding them.• In summary, we do not support designated bike paths, routes or lanes along this alignment, as it will be a detriment to the overall neighborhood character. The bike paths, and money, should be focused on the higher use areas that will really benefit, such as the northern Tempe area near the original ASU campus, or perhaps the City of Tempe should at alignments ½ mile to the north.It would serve the City of Tempe better to invest in neighbor and traffic studies to find more appropriate routes for the new bike path. An alignment at ½ mile north of this location will bring the traffic into the heart of ASU Research Park, closer to the new Discovery Business Center, while still allowing it to move forward into Chandler and Mesa. I do not support a bike route along any of the proposed routes. Another very important safety consideration is that along La Vieve &amp; McClintock, there is a bus stop on each side of McClintock. To add a bicycle crossing to that mix is a horrible combination and would quite possibly lead and contribute to deadly bicycle/car accidents.</p>
Laurie Johnson	1758 E La Vieve Ln	4	
Lloyd Thomas	200 E. Geneva Drive	3	<b>Online:</b> Connectivity is important. Options are good. Even those who normally drive currently may suddenly find they need another option.
Lowell Roemke	9103 S Kachina Dr	1	<b>Online:</b> I don't want it running through my neighborhood in Alta Mira!
MARK EASTWOOD	1009 W 19TH ST	3	<b>Comment Card:</b> I THINK THAT THE SEAT BIKE ROUTE NEEDS TO BE BUILT SO THAT THE ENTIRE SYSTEM WILL FUNCTIUON WELL. I FEEL THAT THE HORSE ISSUE IN CIRCLE G WILL ABATE WITH TIME. THE HORSES IN PAPAGO PARK DID NOT HAVE ISSUES WITH THE CYCLISTS. THIS WAS DUE TO AN INCREASED FREQUENCY OF EXPOSURE TO BIKES.
Martha Rader	8852 S. Lakeshore Drive	4	<b>Online:</b> I am not in favor of any of these routes, all of which go through Corona Del Sol Estates subdivision. The traffic going to Cielo Elementary School is already so terrible that the City had to install speed bumps on Lakeshore. The bike path should be rerouted a block or two south to avoid the grade school traffic.
Martin Burd	1959 E Ranch Rd	1	<b>Online:</b> SIGNAL NEEDS TO BE INSTALLED AT MCCLINTOCK AND LA VIEVE LN IMMEDIATELY!!!! IMPROVE OUR BIKE PATHS!!!
			<b>Email:</b> Tempe City Council, I Have lived in Corona Del Sol on La Vieve lane for 37 years. I do not want the added traffic from the Boulevard.I do not want the city spending the money on a traffic light at McClintock and La Vieve Ln.I do not want my neighborhood to be a public transportation route. Please fire your community development person.
Martin Skalon	1342 E. La Vieve Ln.	4	<b>Comment Card:</b> no comments
Mary Busch	1834 E LaVieve	4	<b>Comment Card:</b> Please divert funding to a different expansion of the bike routes.
Merrily Shinyeda	2001 E. Caroline Ln	4	<b>Comment Card:</b> None of these options. I oppose the bike it program as a waste of tax payer money and don't want it through my neighborhood or pushed onto other neighborhoods. I read the comments on the website and found that those opposing the bike it program where presented with ____ plate comments from the city that were obviously in support of the program. Is no one listening? It sounds like the City is attempting to ram-rod this down our communities throat.

Peter and Merrily Shinyeda	2001 E. Caroline Ln.	4	<p><b>Online:</b> We live on Caroline Lane. Our lot borders the sidewalk that connects Alta Mira and Circle G and our driveway is ten feet from the east end of that walkway. While this walkway is for pedestrian use, we have people coming through on bicycles, motorized scooters, skateboards and, from time to time, motorcycles. The walkway to our (Circle G) cul-de-sac intersects with a sidewalk. No one using this walkway ever uses the sidewalk; rather, they continue directly into the middle of the street. Our driveway is just south of the sidewalk. We back out of our driveway continuing to the north, right in front of the walkway. This has always been a dangerous situation. Designating this pedestrian walkway a "bike boulevard" makes an already hazardous situation even more perilous. We have lived in our home for nearly 20 years and over that time we have had a number of security-related issues that are related to the use of the walkway. These include having our mailbox blown up twice, tree trimmings set on fire and ongoing vandalism to our motion-sensitive security lights. We have been advised by the Tempe Police Department that this area is difficult to secure because of the way the street is connected to the walkway. Across the street, our neighbor installed a security camera directed at the walkway to deter vandalism to his property. In addition, the walkway is not a city street -- the City of Tempe does not maintain it, nor do Circle G HOA or Alta Mira residents. We have accepted the responsibility and expense of maintaining this area for 20 years. During all this time, we have been removing leaves, painting over graffiti and picking up other peoples' trash on a regular basis. For these reasons, we are adamantly opposed to having the proposed Bike Boulevard Seat Route come anywhere near this walkway. We strongly oppose Option2 and Option 3 as these options bring unwanted traffic directly to our doorstep. Having attended the meeting on November 5th and listened to the presentation and responses to questions and concerns voiced by those in attendance, we have concluded that there is a strong push back from residents west of McClintock as well and for this reason, we also cannot support Option 3. Any money designated for this program should be concentrated on major crossings like the one on McClintock at the canal. We don't need more sign pollution and painted arrows through our neighborhoods. Consider using this money to plant trees at Tempe Beach Park.</p>
Michael Brown	Corona Estates	4	<p><b>Email:</b> i live in corona estates ...i do not support a bike route in are neighborhood..NO TO LAKESHORE DRIVE BIKE ROUTE.</p>
MICHAEL ZDANCEWI	39 W STACEY LN	3	<p><b>Comment Card:</b> I WOULD LIKE TO SEE THE BICYCLE NETWORK EXPANDED TO THE FULLEST EXTENT POSSIBLE. A BICYCLE NETWORK FACILITATES A HEALTHY LIFESTYLE AND ENCOURAGES NEIGHBORS TO GET TO KNOW THEIR FRIENDS, NEIGHBORS AND NEIGHBOOD IN A MEANINGFUL MANNER.</p>
Mike Hughes	9195 S. Stanley Place	1	<p><b>Online:</b> I am an avid cyclist and am very appreciative of the City's effort to create these "bike boulevards" to promote cycling and safety. I was at the last community meeting in my area and listened to the concerns of my neighbors. Truthfully, I could not understand their concerns, other than not wanting cyclists in their neighborhood. I do not see cyclists as a threat to property or persons nor do I see them being disrespectful to private property. I hope my neighbors will understand this is a good thing and support it. If nothing else, I hope all of us that support it are as vocal as those who do not. Thank you Tempe for being progressively minded. I've lived here for 46 years and am super proud of my city.</p>
mike rooney	2011 east lavieve lane	1	<p><b>Online:</b> option 1 or 2 would be ok-----no to option 3</p>
Monica Lowe	2128 E. Caroline Lane	1	<p><b>Online:</b> keep bike boulevards out of Alta mesa and Circle G.</p>
Norman and Pam Saba	2017 E. Caroline Ln	1	<p><b>Online:</b> Keep bike routes out of Alta Mira and Circle G.</p> <p><b>Email:</b> Dear Council,We are opposed to bike routes coming into our neighborhoods. There are bike lanes already along Warner that accomplish the same goal. Let's keep public transportation routes on major crossroads and away from our homes, schools and parks.</p>

O'Grady	2049 E Caroline Ln	4	<p><b>Online:</b> I think the data collected from this survey is going to be skewed and inaccurate, and the City Council should be informed of this matter. One reason why I feel this way is because there is no option for "None of the Above," which is what I (and probably others) would have chosen had the option been there. How do you know what residents truly want, when all options are not presented? Also, it was stated at the last meeting that the Option Number 2 bike route will proceed North up Kenwood on the Reflector Route, even though your current map picture shows it stopping on Caroline in Alta Mira with the Reflector Route still in Circle G. Anyone choosing that option, doesn't even have an accurate representation of what they are choosing. In addition to poor data collection techniques, I feel that there was poor planning involved in the selection of a location of the Seat bike path. To start, the bike path crosses through access points that are not owned by the City of Tempe. Additionally, there are approximately 42 homes in the Warner Ranch area that face the bike path due to it passing along their street, when ZERO homes in this area could have been front facing the bike path if Warner Ranch Drive was selected instead of Knox. Warner Ranch Drive is only ONE street South of Knox at this point on the path, and already has bike lanes painted on the street which would save the City of Tempe and their taxpayers' money! Also, any bikers taking Knox through Warner Ranch in the morning or after school will have to stop at a crosswalk that is manned by a crossing guard helping elementary students to cross Warner Ranch Drive (that is already heavily congested with cars and people). This congestion could also have been avoided had Warner Ranch Drive been chosen instead of Knox, and finally, at the end of the original proposed Seat Path at Caroline Lane and Price Road, there is a small s-curved, (approximately 16 foot) one-way, exit street for bikes and cars to share along the bike boulevard. Is this really a good idea for placement of a bike boulevard when a typical nearby neighborhood road is approximately 37 feet wide? Furthermore, if the light signals are not supported/funded by residents, the City of Tempe could end up with a bunch of segmented boulevards/ painted streets, with no connection points on the main roads that would encourage bicycles crossing busy city streets in an unsafe manner. Your alternative options to the Seat Route, only do away with one of these problems (the s-curve exit). The rest of the problems still exist. Please reconsider the location of the bike boulevards to places away from homes, private access sidewalks, and small streets.</p>
Oliver Beck	1602 E La Vieve Ln	4	<p><b>Comment Card:</b> 1) No to all, unsafe! 2) Path already exists. 3) Too many close calls already.</p>
Patricia Conley		4	<p><b>Online:</b> None of the above. This is the second time I am filling out a survey for the bike route and I resent having to do it again. I went to a meeting and listened to most of the people speak against the route. Eric misrepresented the people at the meeting and advised that the city should go ahead. Shou people's property values be lowered so biker's can have unsightly paths running through their neighborhoods? Should the children of the neighborhood have to be wary of strangers riding about? I would have never bought my home thirty years ago if I knew a bike path would be there. I am strongly opposed to any bike path proposed.</p>
Patricia Alexander	947 E Secretariat Dr	3	<p><b>Comment Card:</b> The unfunded signals should be funded.</p>
Patrick Valandra	2800 S Bala Dr	3	<p><b>Online:</b> Thanks for the opportunity to share my opinion. I do not believe that our communities should be a series of arterial streets walling off neighbors and segregating communities. People must have multiple transportation options; otherwise they will be forced to drive.. As Tempe changes, we cannot sustain a large population using cars for every trip. When people choose to ride a bike, they must also have multiple route options just as motor vehicle drivers do. Some routes must be provided on wider, faster and higher traffic arterial roads, while others must be on slower, more comfortable, lower traffic neighborhood streets. This is especially true for neighborhoods with Schools, Parks and Community Centers. It is also a huge improvement to have alternative (walking and biking) access to shopping centers and businesses. People also have different levels of comfort when they ride, walk, or drive. Tempe is an inclusive community and it is important to provide access and opportunity for all people to use different modes of transportation - Thus, adding informational and way finding signage to an already designated bike route gets people through the neighborhoods more effectively. Without it, people who are trying to find a route will get lost more easily, and may go down other side streets or dead end streets. This signage also improves community interaction where neighbors know about and have opportunity to better share PUBLIC infrastructure. As much as I agree with certain community members from the Circle-G Ranch HOA, they do not own the public right of ways and should not force taxpayers to fund their access at the expense of others ability to use and enjoy these amenities. Thank you Patrick Valandra President at The Tempe Bicycle Action Group</p> <p><b>Email:</b> Thanks for taking a stand on alternative transportation here in our Great City! The Seat route is and important part of a larger Tempe-wide system that provides slower and more comfortable route options. The connections to other cities (Chandler) and other bike routes is important and essential as Tempe changes focus from sprawl to infill, from horizontal to vertical. While some (very few) are comfortable riding in the bike lanes on Warner, others do it out of necessity to get to a specific location. That is why we must also have bike lanes and pedestrian options on quieter side streets along with improvements on major roads which allow equal access for all. The focus on car-centric culture should be put to rest in favor of options which reflect the fact that everyone who pays for transportation infrastructure should be able to use it. Most, including experienced cyclists, are not comfortable with just a 6 in stripe of white paint riding next to car traffic going 45-50 mph. We must provide an accessible options along with major street improvements to give equitable treatment to all transportation modes. The Council (you) are doing this and we applaud and support your efforts</p>
Paul Wagner	Caroline lane	1	<p><b>Online</b></p>

Paul and Mirriam Thomas		4	<b>Email:</b> Please, NO on bike boulevards in South Temp neighborhoods. Keep public transportation routes on major crossroads and away from our homes, schools, and parks.
Pete Wagner		4	<b>Email:</b> Please do not put this in south Tempe neighbors. If needed, end at McClintock (option 1) Thank you
Peter Murphy	2050 E Knox Rd.	2	<b>Comment Card:</b> Bicycles are like water, they will flow in the easiest path, markings or not so! Make crossings safe.  <b>Online:</b> Option 3 exit from E Caroline Lane onto Frontage/S Price road will be dangerous. 1. Circle G residents entering their sub-division southbound on Frontage must brake and maneuver into a tight curve/corner onto Caroline. There is not enough space for cars and bicycles and the sudden appearance of a fast car is a danger to cyclists. This entrance would need to be reconfigured 2. Frontage is a one-way southbound road - cyclists intending to travel northbound would need to travel south to Ray and return on east northbound frontage
Philip Poirier	2002 East Caroline Ln	4	<b>Online:</b> I have owned my home on East Caroline Ln. for 20+ years. We purchased our home at the end of a cul-de-sac specifically for the privacy it affords. For this and several other reasons my wife and I are against the City of Tempe funneling bike traffic past our front door.
Priscilla Kadi	1330 E La Vieve Lane	4	<b>Online:</b> All the options should be review to reroute away from La Vieve. If Circle G is opted out then Corona del Sol deserves the same consideration. This a huge devaluation to the street and is also a safety concern for bikers as well as our households. Was on vacation during the public hearing. Reconsider...not too late.
Rachel Harbour		4	<b>Email:</b> To whom it may concern, This is in response to the proposed bike route through Corona del Sol Estates. As a fifteen year resident in this neighborhood, I find that we already have a significant amount of traffic on our streets. In particular, I live on La Vieve, which tends to be a high traffic corridor for vehicles. I oppose the proposed addition of bike routes through Corona del Sol estates, and especially on La Vieve Lane. Please help us to maintain a peaceful and safe neighborhood by not establishing bike routes through Corona del Sol, or at least not on La Vieve Ln. Thank you for your consideration,



Richard and Louise Sallquist	2166 E. Caroline Ln.	<p><b>Online: OPPOSITION TO BIKE BOULEVARDS</b> We are writing to state our opposition to the addition of “bike boulevards” through the Alta Mira and Circle G Ranch subdivisions. We live in Circle G, so our comments address primarily that leg of the proposal. We apologize for the length of our comments, but believe there are important points to register. We know that others have spoken to you regarding the inappropriateness of encouraging “swarms” of bicycle riders through our residential neighborhoods. Certainly the vast majority of the attendees at the November 5 meeting were opposed to any of the alternatives. Promoting unauthorized and “unpurposeful” traffic through any subdivision is not in best interest of the City or its residents. First and foremost this route is not needed. There is an existing uninterrupted bike lane with painted stripes running parallel to Option 3 from McClintock to Price. The alignment is along of Windmill, Park and Seville. This is in Chandler about 1/4 mile south of the proposed route. There are also routes along Warner and Ray. Bike path planning is a regional issue and should recognize and include adjoining city's paths as well. It is noteworthy that the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) "Bike Ways" of 2008 already shows the Option 3 route as a "Bike Route". With its existing path, Chandler has solved this problem for Tempe. Surely bikers do not need FOUR routes from McClintock to Price within the Warner/Ray corridor. Second, the proposal is inconsistent with possible future neighborhood needs. You may recall that several years ago the Circle G Ranch's subdivision street patterns were significantly altered. Three of the streets entering the Price frontage road were closed, and the Caroline entrance/exit was modified to accommodate vehicle gating of the community. I understand there is a renewed interest in the possibilities of installing those gates on Caroline at Price and on Fairfield Drive at Warner, with a pedestrian gate at the west end of Caroline. Bike paths would be completely incompatible with a gated community. We would also like to speak to some safety issues. First as to Caroline Lane. That street is the major arterial for Circle G residents leaving the subdivision to the south and entering from the north. There is no other Price Road entrance or exit to the subdivision. That road is 40 feet wide, curb to curb. With a six-foot bike path on either side, it leaves only 28 feet of roadway for significant two-way traffic. Even if the lanes are not painted, the traffic restrictions will be present. When adding parked cars and trash containers to the formula it obviously becomes very dangerous. Further, the exit from Caroline onto the Price Road frontage road, (the Price Road on-ramp) is a single lane 20 foot wide street with a double ess curve that is blind to the oncoming southbound Price Road traffic. Again, with a 6 foot wide bike path, that leaves only 14 feet for the vehicular traffic on that double curved road. The "off-ramp" from southbound Price to Caroline suffers from the same problematic narrow curved configuration. Additionally, upon bikers entering the Circle G Ranch's subdivision route the rider would have no option but to proceed through the entire distance of the subdivision and down Price Road. Deviating from that route would subject the rider to the dead-end maze of the subdivision. When leaving Circle G, the only permitted direction of travel is south on the one-way frontage road. There are only two streets which bikers can use to exit Price before reaching Ray Road. Northbound bike traffic would be impermissible as there is only a sidewalk. As Staff indicated at the meeting, sidewalk bike traffic is four times more dangerous than path traffic. Moreover, there are NO exits going north until reaching Warner Road. It was apparent from the meeting that the Seat Route creates some additional safety issues. Directing bike traffic across major arterials at McClintock and Rural just begs for an accident. Putting up signals at those mid-mile locations is not only costly (stated to be \$150-200 K each), but installing these signals to accommodate bikers directly and substantially interferes with already difficult automobile traffic. Just look at the signal at the Canal and Rural. Must a few bikers "rights" interfere with the rights of the mass of public in cars? We understand and respect that bicycling is a very popular recreation. ( Drive the streets on Saturday or Sunday and compare the "recreation" bike traffic volume with the week-day "commuter" traffic). We do not believe that residential neighborhoods should be forced to suffer the inconvenience, distraction, and automobile safety problems resulting from the desires of the relatively few individuals who can otherwise get their exercise on the existing dedicated bike paths on our major traffic thoroughfares. If bike safety is truly the only motivation for this proposal, as it should be, the City should simply adopt a program to: (1) educate bikers on needed caution on the incredible existing bike paths already in place, and (2) advise bikers to exercise their existing option to use unmarked subdivision streets. There is no necessity or benefit to direct bikers through selected neighborhoods on “bike boulevards”. Please abandon all of these options or at worst adopt Option 3 that does not funnel all bike traffic along one street in one subdivision.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
---------------------------------	----------------------	---

Richard Johnson	1758 E. La Vieve Lane	4	<p><b>Online:</b> I, DO NOT SUPPORT, A DESIGNATED BIKE PATH, LANE OR FUTURE BIKE TRAFFIC LIGHT FOR THE BIKE SEAT ROUTE IN THE LA VIEVE LN/KNOX RD ALIGNMENT. While cycling in Tempe is supported in my household, below are the specific reasons why it is NOT supported in this alignment:• Safety is an utmost concern. As residents who are required to back out onto a ¼ mile through street, there is a fair amount of traffic that exist on this street already during early morning to late business hours. • As residents of the Corona del Sol neighborhood, we are not wanting to encourage additional traffic, bike or otherwise, into our neighborhood. We already have enough traffic with the residents and the traffic into the neighborhood for the schools. We feel this proposed effort by the City of Tempe will not benefit us but, will in fact do just the opposite. • Based on observation, early morning hours brings a tremendous amount of traffic down northbound-southbound McClintock Drive already. Adding eastbound-westbound traffic is a recipe for unsafe and congestion that can be avoided. • Further, the eventual backing up of stalled traffic on McClintock Drive will lead to additional carbon emissions in the immediate area. This becomes a health issue. In short, this will impede the flow of traffic. • Additional cycling or automobile traffic into this area will only lead to an installation of a traffic signal in the future. This act will add a tremendous unsafe burden of traffic coming from blind spots and directed on the immediate residents on the corner homes adjacent to McClintock Drive. My driveway entrance CANNOT be shifted westerly. Even one fatality here is too many. In turn, this is considered as additional risks imposed on the residents when in fact the neighborhood will not be the biggest beneficiary of the traffic signal. • If this seat route and eventual traffic signal is added to La Vieve, it will inevitably change the La Vieve homeowners street parking rights, regular, recycle, and bulk trash pick-up requirements. • The neon/florescent light emitted by the traffic light signage is highly visible and causes problems during sleeping hours at night. • When all of the above conditions are combined, it leads to reduced home values for the immediate residents, liability and legal issues. • ASU Research Park and its new leases will be the biggest recipients and beneficiary of the seat route and this will be accomplished at the expense of the Corona Del Sol, Circle G, and Alta Mira neighborhoods. This is a huge question that should be addressed. It would be very wrong, politically or otherwise of the Tempe City Council to impose this hardship on the residents of these neighborhoods. • There are already well marked and designated bike paths along McClintock and the various cross streets (Warner, Elliott, etc.) and there is not a true need for bikes to cross through the interior neighborhoods. • Money for bike paths should be spent on the truly well-used areas, such as the canal paths, and expanding them. • The money for a bike crossing light would be much better spent at a high use area that truly needs it, such as the crossing for the Western Canal bike path at Guadalupe. This is a heavy use area, plus it's right next to the high use park of Kiwanis, that could really use a bike crossing light. • In summary, my household do not support designated bike paths, routes or lanes along the bike seat alignment, as it will be a detriment to the overall neighborhood character. The bike paths, and money, should be focused on the higher use areas that will really benefit, such as the northern Tempe area near the original ASU campus, or perhaps the City of Tempe should at alignments ½ mile to the north. It would serve the City of Tempe better to invest in neighbor and traffic studies to find more appropriate routes for the new bike path. An alignment at ½ mile north of this location will bring the traffic into the heart of ASU Research Park, closer to the new Discovery Business Center, while still allowing it to move forward into Chandler and Mesa.</p> <p><b>Email:</b> I live in the Corona Del Sol Estate neighborhood. I'm inquiring about the proposed bike lane and traffic light at La Vieve Lane and McClintock Drive. First, my wife and I are proponents of the cycling paths here in Tempe. My household took part in the meeting and the survey earlier this year. My concern is that my home will be directly impacted by the proposed improvements as I have witnessed so far. There are safety, logistics and financial concerns that need to be addressed. I have invested a considerable amount of money in my home in recent years and feel that south Tempe is one of the leading communities in metropolitan Phoenix, so this is just one of the reasons why I have a concern about potential problems that result from the bike lane implementation. I've attached a typical cross-section of the La Vieve Lane roadway down below and have listed my questions below that refer to that cross-section exhibit as follows: 1) The proposed bike lane and stop light at La Vieve Lane will have a safety impact on my driveway. My driveway is located on the east side of my home and directly connects to the northwest curb return at this intersection. Additional bike traffic will add more moving objects that could easily be hidden by blind spots in this intersection. Most vehicles from this household pull out onto the street forward, and even then care must be taken to avoid hidden dangers. I understand this is an intersection, however adding more traffic and risks to existing households is not the answer. This move could be a liability for everyone involved. 2) Have there been any home valuation studies done on this bike lane addition proposal? This is another reason for my opposition to this proposal. As mentioned above, I've invested a considerable amount of money in my home. 3) Most or possibly all street parking will be impacted by the proposed bike lane. Has it been determined that street parking will no longer exist? 4) The mail delivery may become an issue due to congestion in the proposed lane. 5) Recycle and green waste bins, and bulk waste are normally stored in this area until the City of Tempe's pick-up. I'm sure the lane will have an impact on this service. Can you provide what measures are being proposed for this potential problem? 6) If the recycle and green waste bins, and bulk waste are to remain in the usual locations and within the proposed bike lane then, this act will more than likely force more cyclist onto the sidewalks. This may also become an issue. 7) Relating to the proposed stop light I mentioned above in item 1, this action will cause more traffic back up on McClintock Drive. This action will eventually lead to added vehicular emissions in a specific smaller area of the neighborhood. In a sense, this area will become a parking lot early morning and late afternoon during rush hour traffic. This can cause respiratory problem for individuals living nearby. 8) Having a bike traffic light at McClintock and La Vieve would be too congested for this area as it is also right next to the entry/exit ways for the business Beauty Mall that is barely 150 feet north of La Vieve. To have these items so close together is 'just an accident waiting to happen'. 9) As residents of this lovely neighborhood, we are not looking to encourage additional traffic, bike or otherwise, into our neighborhood. The bike traffic lights should be reserved for truly hi-use bicycle/pedestrian running paths such as the ones at the Western Canal crossings – not for neighborhoods of single family homes. In summary, this proposed traffic light and bike lane will be creating problems that currently do not exist. Another question is why are the residents of this neighborhood giving up certain conveniences, while taking on other risks? Lastly, it appears that the city's survey yield that over 61% of the</p>
-----------------	-----------------------	---	--

			respondents voted no to having the stop light at the intersection, so why is this proposal still moving forward without the overall community's agreement? Please respond to my questions and concerns above. Thank you sincerely,
RICHARD STANEART	2002 E. MYRNA LN.	4	<b>Online:</b> I live in Circle G Ranch a horse property development. this is not an area in witch we need bikes around are horses, its just not compatible.They have used Warner rd. for years I see no advantage for this route.
RICHARD WELLS	41 E SARAH LN	4	<b>Comment Card:</b> NONE OF THE OPTIONS SEEM SUITABLE.
Rick Lash	48 E. Dawn Drive	3	<b>Online:</b> 1. Eric and Julian did a nice job at the meeting Nov. 5th. Unfortunately, several people were very rude by speaking out of turn, hogging the floor, and criticizing some of the people speaking. RULES should be presented at the beginning of a meeting allowing questions/comments after the facilitators presentation and limiting each person to 5 minutes until everyone that wants to talk has had their chance. 2. A very nice route. Kudos to those who picked it. It has a few issues, particularly concerning safety, that I agree with. But no route will be without it's own problems that need to prioritized and removed based on financial availability.3. There are several parks along the route, but I don't believe any of them have rest room facilities. That may be an item for future consideration on the Bike Grid as older bicyclists as well as the youngsters will be glad to have them.
Robert Busch	1834 E. LaVieve Ln.	4	<b>Online:</b> I do not support the "Seat Route" through my neighborhood, Alta Mira. I live on LaVieve Lane. I feel strongly that this "bike boulevard" will create a danger for the bicyclists and the individuals who have driveways that enter on LaVieve. Please use our tax dollars to support the project in other areas of Tempe.
Robert Forrest	1811 E. LaVieve	4	<b>Email:</b> To the Mayor and City Council:This is a request to cancel or reroute the Seat Plan. It is not fair to vote for a plan that looks good on paper, but down here in the real world, will harm those living along the route. The roadway east of McClintock is about 30 feet wide - not wide enough to support cars parked on both sides, with cars and large trucks traveling in both directions, and then you hope to squeeze bike paths in while leaving safety space between all these! This ill-conceived plan could bring disruptions, noise, traffic accidents, personal injuries, potential criminal elements, and reductions in property values. This Seat Plan should be scrapped entirely, or relocated to ONLY the main arteries. Otherwise as a minimum, the La Vieve leg should terminate west of McClintock. Thank you.
Ryan Guzy	1065 W 2nd st	3	<b>Comment Card:</b> This project is about full access for all types of people to all roads in Tempe. It is essential that all of Tempe be given safe and comfortable routes to ride their bikes.
Ryan James Furcini	184 E Visat Del Cerro Dr	3	<b>Online</b>
SAM WINTER	2028 E CAROLINE LN	4	<b>Comment Card:</b> I DON'T BELIEVE THERE IS A NEED FOR THE PATH. YOU CANNOT CROSS PRIVATE PROPERTY AT LAVIEVE AND KENWOOD. IF BIKERS WANT TO USE THESE PATHS THEY ALREADY CAN, NO NEED FOR SIGNS. IT IS NOT SMART TO ____ BIKERS ON CARLINE AND PRICE. UNSAFE TO GET SOUTH. ILLEGAL TO GO NORTH.
scott allan	9730 S GRANDVIEW DR	3	<b>Online</b>
Sean Kelly	8957 South Ash Avenue	4	<b>Online:</b> I have been a Warner Ranch resident since 1988. We do not need the Bike Boulevard Seat Route in South Tempe. It is a waste of taxpayers money. Thank you.
Sherman Dorn	1059 W Myrna Ln	3	<b>Online</b>

Shirly King		4	<b>Email:</b> Bike Boulevard "Seat" Route Are you out of your mind. You need to study this again. Parents are delivering children in the morning and picking them up in the afternoon. They do not live in this neighborhood, which increases the traffic and puts children on bikes or walking at a increased risk. There is a light at Warner and McClintock now another one a block latter would cause a backup, and anxiety which could in up with a mess and might increase the danger. I do have a suggestion No seems to walk on the sidewalks on Warner Rd or McClintock. In fact why not make all of them a bike/walking path in Tempe Thank you for your attention.
Shyam Avvari	2059 E Caroline Lane	4	<b>Online:</b> Please keep the public transportation routes on major crossroads and away from our homes and parks.
Somerset P-B	8252 S Homestead Lane	3	<b>Online:</b> I road my bike all through middle school and high school. This would've helped a ton and made my ride a lot more safe. The congestion caused by students not car pooling, 1 to a car takes up a ton of space in the morning and makes the intersections hectic to get through.
STEPHANIE L TERRELL	430 w 6th St apt8	3	<b>Online</b>
Steve Sheard	242 W Knox Rd	3	<b>Online:</b> I am in favor of the Bike Route in front of mu house. I consider bicycles a good thing and a benefit to the neighborhood as it will reduce vehicle traffic. Plus bicyclists get to enjoy my wonderful front yard more than a motorist! <b>Email:</b> Dear Sir / Madam,I am in favor of the Bike Route in front of my home on Knox Rd. I consider bicycles a good thing and a benefit to the neighborhood as it will reduce vehicle traffic. Plus bicyclists get to enjoy my wonderful front yard more than a motorist!Regards
STEVEN CALVIN	1411 E CAROLINE LN	4	<b>Comment Card:</b> AGAINST THESE OPTIONS. I LIVE IN CORONA DEL SOL ESTATES AND MY NEIGHBORS, I'VE DISCUSSED THIS WITH ONE AGAINST HAVING A DESIGNATED BIKE PATH THROUGH IT. WE ALSO BELIEVE A SIGNAL SOUTH OF WARNER IS LAME BASED ON TRAFFIC COUNT. ADDITIONALLY, WE DO NOT WANT THE CLOSURE ON KNOX AT LAKESHORE, TO BE OPENED OR MODIFIED IN ANY WAY.
Susan Woods	701 E Courtney Ln	3	<b>Online:</b> For me, the longer route the better and the fact that is connects to Price/101 seems to be the best advantage of Option 3. I would be concerned that the railroad crossing is made as smooth as possible as the crossing at Elliot and Kyrene can be quite dangerous if not crossed with care. I am assuming that there is a paved bike path along the canal west of Priest which is why the path goes to it.



			<p><b>Online and Email (duplicate):</b> I am resident of Circle G Ranch and oppose the proposed Seat Route largely because I have no idea why it's needed in our neighborhood. Several of my neighbors have already commented on the safety concerns so I will not belabor the points. Instead, I would like to address the comments of the City's Public Information Officer, Sue Taaffe, in her response to prior comments from Circle G residents. "These bike boulevards are intended to make riding a bike to a neighborhood school or park easier for those people living in the neighborhoods near the route." (Taaffe)• So, you're trying to make it easier for us in our neighborhood? I am not aware of a single Circle G resident who has asked for, wants or requires City funds and intervention to make it easier to find our park and there is no school or other public accommodation of any kind located within Circle G. "We do not anticipate a dramatic increase in ridership from outside your neighborhood to use these bike boulevards . . ." (Taaffe)• Ok, so if the changes aren't for people outside the neighborhood and the people inside the neighborhood don't want or need them, then what's the point? Especially given that Circle G is bordered by wide sidewalks and bike lanes on both Warner and Price Roads."Again, we do not anticipate an increase in people entering your neighborhood to use these bike boulevards, which are already signed as bike routes in many places along the proposed route. We would simply be switching out the signage in your area to brand the bike route as the Seat route. . . .While there is no guarantee that there will not be new bicyclists on the route, as mentioned before, there is no indication that the new signage would result in non-neighborhood users." (Taaffe)• To be clear, these areas are NOT currently marked in Circle G and the proposed plan will ADD six signs. And again, if no non-neighborhood users are expected and the neighborhood users don't want or need signs, then what's the point?"The intention with this bicycle boulevard system is to enhance walking and biking opportunities in the 10 neighborhoods, and to integrate in with the space available, not disrupt the area. The goal of adding the signage along the streets is to guide your neighbors along the Seat route to connect them to other parts of south Tempe." (Taaffe)• With all due respect, our family of five has, for years, biked in and out of neighboring communities just fine without \$100,000 in signage. We ride up to Paradise Bakery for breakfast. We ride over to the Chandler Mall for lunch. We ride to Dunkin Donuts. We ride to Safeway. We've even managed to find our way to public parks outside of Circle G. We did this all without signs and in a safe manner on the wide sidewalks that our taxes have already provided. Bikers have commented that they get around just fine with Google maps. Other bikers, according to their comments, are more concerned with lights and signage at major intersections. There is nothing "major" about the quiet community streets in Circle G that would be impacted. To the contrary, the streets impacted are lined with homes and children playing – nothing resembling a thoroughfare. Taken together this has left me scratching my head. Why change the character of our neighborhoods? Who will this benefit? Who even asked for it? Couldn't we spend this money on something more needed, our schools perhaps? I appreciate the opportunity to comment and urge the Council to reject this plan.</p> <p><b>Email 2:</b> Thank you for your prompt response to my concerns. I'm sure this has taken a great deal of your time, and that of your colleagues, and I really do appreciate it. That said, the idea that this is to "aid" current and future residents just feels like government trying to dictate what's best for us as if we don't know better. For what it's worth, this is one resident (and family) saying no thank you to the aid, please reallocate the \$5000 ( or whatever part would be spent in Circle G) to a neighborhood that wants it. My opposition stands and I will look forward to the Council's vote. Sincerely,</p>
Tanya Wheeless	2106 E. La Vieve Lane	4	
Thomas Collins	LaVieve Ln.	4	<p><b>Email:</b> I live on La Vieve Ln on one of the proposed routes. Our street is in a quiet development. Most of the car traffic issues are related to the local grade school attendance, in addition to residents. Adding a bike route would significantly reduce the peacefulness of our area.</p>
Tim		4	<p><b>Email:</b> I am concerned about this project on many levels. Although I want my city to be fresh and modern, I struggle with this one. Here is why: In a city of roughly 173,000, we have maybe a 100 or 200 people at most making pretty big decisions and commenting on how this will affect our neighborhoods and streets. Hardly a mandate! I think we need to think these things through a bit more! I live in the Priest and Knox area, which has and continues to be, inundated with 100's of new apartment homes in an already congested area with more to come. Priest is already a disaster with the AM/PM freeway traffic side-stepping the 10. Now we are talking about putting a bike route in for commuters and families?? Has anyone on the council or with this project done a legitimate impact study or are we just listening to the builders and special interest groups?</p>

Tim & Debbie Overton		4	<p><b>Email:</b> I tried to find the location on the Bikeit web site to provide my comments/thoughts but was not successful. Thus I am emailing to you and the green door hanger says the comment period ends today. After reading all of the published materials and comments on the Tempe.gov/bikeit website regarding the “Seat Bicycle Boulevard” (La Vieve/Knox), I do not understand why the City of Tempe would continue with this project and I do not support it. It is very apparent from all of the material available, that there is overwhelming opposition to any of the routes and the expenditure of \$100K of CIP budget funds for the first phase. City staff have presented and/or written the below highlighted information in public meetings, responses to residents or correspondence within city government. Here are my comments/questions from the highlighted information below that came from the city Bikeit website: • How does this project make it easier for neighborhood residents to ride to a nearby park or school? How does it become an additional amenity for the neighborhoods? • Residents as well as recreational riders know the neighborhoods and pathways. They ride them now, they do not need a seat route identified to help them. • Why does the city need to “enhance” these areas if many places have been marked for 20 years and you do not anticipate a dramatic increase in ridership? • Why alter the existing names and spend the money to change the naming on the signage? This is a waste of time and money. • Residents know their neighborhoods and do not need signage. Bike riders know or can find pathways/routes/seats on the tempe.gov web site and they know the already existing arterial bike routes. • Students can already ride to schools now without the seat route markings. • What statistical data and methods were used to determine that the city does not anticipate an increase in traffic, especially “non-neighborhood” users as stated? • Why create another “intersection” just south of Warner for more potential traffic/bicycle accidents at La Vieve? Riders should use the existing signal at Warner. An additional intersection along McClintock with the recent decrease of vehicle lanes from 3 to 2 not only creates traffic congestion but longer commutes and potential pollution increase while vehicles are sitting at lights. • Issuance of door hangers was apparently a problem in other areas as well as those noted. I live within the specified notification area and have only received a yellow notice for the 3rd public meeting and a green one for online input. Both of these hangers were received within the last 4 weeks. I have checked with other neighbors in my neighborhood and they did not receive the previous described hangers. Quite possibly, the majority of the residents commenting about the signals live east of McClintock because many residents west of McClintock did not receive the door hangers and thus were not aware so they could not comment. • My extended family (multiple residences within Tempe) ride bicycles a lot and they know existing paths and neighborhoods to get where they need or want to go, including the major arterial pathways. We do not need or want the city to expend funds on this project. • The responses/comments received to date overwhelmingly show that the residents/neighborhoods are not in favor of the project concept or expenditure of funds for this project. The numbers quoted by staff speak loudly: 13 of 35 were generally favorable to some type of bicycle amenities. 5 of 5 emails received were opposed to the bike boulevard designation. 22 of 36 respondents that commented on the signalized crossing at McClintock and La Vieve were not in favor of it. Please listen to the responses from the taxpaying residents in these neighborhoods and abort this project. Riders can use what is already existing and working for them. Respectfully,</p>
Tom & Melly Wasson	9405 S Kenneth	4	<p><b>Comment Card:</b> We did not vote for this or request it. City Council is pushing something that is not needed. Waste of money. More like traffic near CDS High could be dangerous also near Cielo Elementary this should be dropped.</p>
Tom Krehbiel	2038 East Ranch Rd	1	<p><b>Online:</b> I recommend that another route be chosen.</p>
Tom Sutton		4	<p><b>Email:</b> Am opposed to any additional activity on Knox Road by Mariposa School. This is just on the other side of my backyard. I want continued peace without any new traffic that may happen. I can just see the weekend traffic will increase a 1000% so I am opposed to any of the 3 options proposed.</p>
Tyler Viliborghi	6831 S. Willow Dr.	3	<p><b>Comment Card:</b> This is absolutely vital for the creation of a truly multi modal transportation network.</p>
Usha Krishnasamy	2043 East Caroline Ln	4	<p><b>Online:</b> I am not choosing any of the options (Options 1, 2, or 3) listed above. My option is Option 4: None of the above, which is not offered as a valid option to pick. I do NOT want the Bike Blvd Seat Route through any of the Tempe neighborhoods. There are already pre established paths that should be promoted to be used, rather than waste precious tax dollars to create new paths.</p>
Vena Lahn	1842 E La Vieve Ln	3	<p><b>Online:</b> I support maximizing bike paths and bike safety. The group opposed to this route seem to be concerned that it will slow traffic down. I fully support any infrastructure which will slow down traffic. Slowing down for bicycles and a potential traffic light at McClintock and La Vieve is a solid plan that will make our neighborhood safer for bicyclists and pedestrians thus moving toward a community less dependent upon vehicles.</p>

Warner Ranch Landing II	Warner Ranch	0	<b>Email:</b> The Warner Ranch Landing II Association commends the City of Tempe for its ongoing effort to improve bicycle travel in our community with the proposed SEAT plan. Currently, there are 3 proposed SEAT routes. Unfortunately, all of these paths cut through our neighborhood on a sidewalk in a small greenbelt (Tract A) privately owned by the Landing II Association. These routes would force bike riders to navigate a narrow walkway with a wall on one side and a steep decline on the other. Further endangering the riders, the path requires them to skirt around the sharp metal edges of a large US postal box. Taken together, these factors create liabilities and expenses that should not be foisted upon Tempe taxpayers nor onto Landing II residents, and therefore, the Landing II HOA board does not grant permission for this use of our private property for the SEAT Bicycle Boulevard or for any other bike route. Fortunately, there is a much safer and more affordable alternate route readily available. This path would begin at the intersection of Kyrene Road and Knox Road and proceed a short distance south on the east side of Kyrene. Here there is a wide flat sidewalk quite suitable for both foot and bike traffic. The riders could then connect to Warner Ranch Drive where there are already existing bike lanes. This route is much safer for bikers and less costly for The City of Tempe, and therefore, is a far better choice to serve the needs of bike riders in our community. Respectfully, The Board of Directors Warner Ranch Landing II Association
Wendy Howe		4	<b>Email:</b> is there anyway you could tell me how many of the residents of Tempe ride their bikes to work on a weekday? And also how many Tempe residents actually work in Tempe? I feel we are spending way too much money on a few people who ride bikes and all this bike friendly business is not something we can afford and therefore will pass the cost on to the Tempe taxpayers. I am also not in favor of telling bicyclists how to cut through our neighborhoods with the Bikeit program.
Yvette David	9494 S. Michele Lane	4	<b>Online:</b> Do not want the bike path coming through Warner Ranch. The two greenbelts that connect knox road are owned by the HOA and will increase our costs and/or potential liabilities if anyone gets hurt. The smaller path connecting Duskfire to Warner Ranch is too small for bikes and pedestrians and there is a steep drop off to a drainage basin so pedestrians cannot step off the path easily. Lots of people walk dogs, push strollers etc through there and where will they go. Not wanting large bicycle groups riding though our neighborhood. Need an option 4 - Don't want it at all. Please add a crosswalk on Warner to connect our small link of canal from Kyrene to Warner with the larger canal system that already has cross walk signals. I can only ride the western canal out to Gilbert if I am crossing Warner in non rush hour. Even then have to cross half way and hope as cars go way too fast.
Zina Alam	1619 e 12th St	3	<b>Online:</b> This would let me bike to visit my mom, so I'd build up quite the appetite and she'd finally be satisfied that I eat enough!
no name provided		4	<b>Online:</b> I live on Knox Rd. It is already too busy during the day. Too near the school. Too many driveways, 18 on our one block. Find another route.
	option	1	14
	option	2	4
	option	3	53
	option	4	75
	None	0	1
	total route option responses		146
	total responses		147